THE EISENHOWER LIBRARY
3 1151 02721 3580
MORAVIA
SPEC. COLL.

71.251

Library

of the
Johns Hopkins University

Child
Clarence Griffin
1895
c. 1

Palatalization in English

I.

Anglo-Saxon Dialects

Dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Johns Hopkins University, by Clarence Griffin Child.

Baltimore.
April. 1895.

71.251

Contents.

Works Referred to . . . . . i.

Introduction . . . . . 1.

Initial Palatal Diphthongisation 21

Northumbrian 27

Mercian 43

Kentish 48

W. Saxon 64

Medial Palatalisation 77

Northumbrian 85

Mercian 123

Kentish 141

W. Saxon 196

Conclusion 239

Works Referred To.

Braune, W: Ueber den gramm. Wechsel in der deutschen Verbalflexion, in Paul u. Braune's Beitr. 1874. I. 513-527.

Ten Brink, B: Altenglisches g(3). in Anglia. 1878, I. 511-

: Chaucer's Sprache u. Verskunst, Leipzig, 1884. 12°

Brunn, E.M: Die Sprache der Rushworth Glossen zum Evangelium Matthäus und der mercische Dialekt. Diss. Göttingen. 1891. 12°

Cosijn, P.J: Altwestsächsische Grammatik Haag, 1888. 12°

Dieter, F: Ueber Sprache und Mundart der ältesten englischen Denkmäler, der Epinaler und Cambridger Glossen. Göttingen. 1885. 12°

Ellis, A.J: On Early English Pronunciation, Part. II. 1869. 12°

Förster, E.: Zur Geschichte d. eng. Gaumenlaute. in Anglia. 1884. Anzeig. 7, 43-81

Hempl, G.: O.E. ēa = Germanic ā̆ and Old English Shortening before H + cons., in Mod. Lang. Notes. 1892. VII. 197f.

Kluge, F.: Geschichte d. eng. Sprache. in Paul's Grundriss. I. V. 836-850.

: Review of Sievers's Ags. Grammatik. 2te Aufl. in Literaturblatt, 1887 VIII. 112.

: A.S. cepan. in Paul u. Braune's Beitr. 1882. VIII. 539-587.

Lea, E. M.: The language of the Northumbrian glosses to the gospel of St. Mark. Part 1., Phonology. in Anglia 1893. XVI. 62-134.

Lindelöf, U.: Die Sprache des Rituals von Durham. Helsingfors. 1890. 12°

Logeman, L: Rule of St. Benet, London 1888, 12°

Morsbach, L: Review of Pogatscher (q.v) in Literaturblatt, 1889, X. 96–100

Murray, J.A.H: Old English Herb. in-egan in Transactions of the Philolog-ical Society, 1882–4. London and Strasburg. 1885.

Platt, J: Ags. fetian, feccan. in Anglia, 1883, VI. 176f.

Pogatscher, A: Zur Lautlehre der Griechischen Lateinischen u. Romanischen Lehnwörter in Alt-Englischen. in Quellen u. Forschungen. 1888. LXIV 178–194

Sievers, E: Old English Grammar (trans. T ed. by Cook) 2d ed., Boston, —. Review of Zupitzas Elene. in Anglia 1878, I. 575.

Zu den Angelsächsischen Glossen. in Anglia 1891. XIII. pp. 301–352.

Miscellen zur Angelsächsischen Grammatik, in Paul u. Braune's Beiträge. 1883. IX. 117–300.

in Paul u. Braune Beiträge. 1885, XII. 484

Sweet, H: History of English Sounds. London. 1874

Dialects and Prehistoric Forms of Old English. in Trans. of the Philological Society. 1875-76. 543 ff.

History of English Sounds and Dialects, in Proceedings of the Phil. Soc., Dec. 5 1879, April 16 1880.

Shell and Chicken. ib. June 3, 1881.

History of g in English. ib. Feb. 2. 1883

Wulff. K: Untersuchung der Laute in den Kentischen Urkunden. Heidelberg. 1893.

Woodward. B.D: Palatal Consonants in English. New York. 1891

Zenner. K: Die Sprache des Kentischen Psalters (Vespasian A.1.) Halle 1881.

Zupitza. J: Cynewulfs Elene. Berlin. 1877

"Wer eine zusammenfassende Untersuchung zur Lösung der vorhandenen Schwierigkeiten unternimmt, wird dialektische Verschiedenheiten und einzelne Sprachepochen scharf zu sondern haben."

Ten Brink. Ch.'s Chr. u. Versk., §41. Anm.

Introduction.

In its simplest terms, the problem presented by palatalisation in English is as follows.

The Anglo-Frisian derived from the Germanic a group of gutteral sounds, and with these as the single palatal sound, the semivowel j. These sounds passed into Anglo-Saxon in all probability practically unchanged, except for i-umlaut. The gutteral group consisted of a voiceless stop k, possibly a voiced stop g, a voiced and voiceless spirant, g and h. These suffered palatal affection by assimilation with certain of the palatal vowels and in certain consonantal combinations, a change manifested and in fact only to be perceived in the written records by the aid of such action or reaction upon the neighboring vowels as necessitated orthographic recognition. Only in the case of one or two words has palatal affection

displayed itself by use of a symbol other than
the individual and invented for the occasion. It
itself. In general, we know that there was pal-
atal affection, but we may also be certain that
there was not such differentiation in quality as
to demand the use of new orthographic expe-
dients.

Such is the state of the case in Anglo-Saxon.
Passing, as we are in the habit of doing, at
a single step from West Saxon conditions to
Middle English conditions, we find at our com-
mand the most abundant and at the same
time most bewilderingly diversified evidence
of the workings of palatalization. Special spel-
lings of both consonants and vowels, indicating
changes in quantity and quality, all of which are
part of the development, now perplex the
student by their multiplicity, and then in
complex dialectic distribution. The ...

element moreover has brought in its own special problems of palatalisation and assibilation. Moreover the voiced guttural stop, of whose presence in Anglo Saxon we may be reasonably sure in a single consonant combination only, has in a way difficult to explain to a great extent taken the place of the spirant.

The first and simpler question is, under what general conditions did palatalisation take place? The second and much more perplexing one is with regard to the progress of the affection at various periods; — the exact character of the sounds under consideration at various times.

The first question has been answered in a rough and ready way. It was readily possible to compare W. S. forms with each other and with resultant forms in Middle English and to obtain the necessary information even with a certain precision. This holds true particularly of initial

diphthongisation; the phenomena of medial palatalisation, vocalisation, and labialisation were not clearly or fully explained. Observations and generalisations were of the most elementary character. This was partly due to neglect of the dialectal element in the problem in Middle English, a neglect perhaps pardonable since only the general proportions of the problem were being sought; partly to the entirely disproportionate importance attached, even in the one or two more careful treatments of the subject, to a few stock examples of conspicuous neatness as illustrating the theory, and several difficult exceptions, in familiar words which obtruded themselves upon attention; right again to the fact that changes in the associated vowels were not considered as a means of gaining information with regard to changes in the consonant; and finally, to the neglect of the dialectic element in Anglo-Saxon

not so much in the way of a neglect of the marked dialectic differences, as in the fact that the dialect, accepted as a norm, attracted so large a share of the attention, that consciously or unconsciously, its peculiar dialectic features were regarded with especial respect, as if they were a sort of standing witness of the proper development of the language — the result of which was of course to prejudice judgment.

These comments may be readily justified by example. Even ignorance with regard to the simpler and more elementary conclusions already gained may be illustrated by the fact that the author of an Encyklopaedie und Methodologie der englischen Philologie can rules "king" and "kitchen" as belonging the numerous exceptions" to the rule that c > ch before palatal vowels — and again from the fact

Körting, §26. I.1

that although the letter g has had its history especially written, no one has been at pains to state under what conditions g became y; here, also Klugé's remarks might perhaps be instanced "Ist doch sogar zweifelhaft, ob sein Umlaut e [von germ. ă] stets palatalisiert; me. cheres, chéle weisen auf ae. céfes cele. (aus *kabis *kali)" – not at all necessarily, but from ciefes < *čeabis < *kabis. General neglect of the dialectic element in Middle English is emphasised by such an illuminating duplex of dialectal differences as that afforded by Dr. Murray in his treatment of the word "Chaff" in the New English Dictionary. The general instances upon particular examples and exceptions hardly needs exemplification – "cheak" and "cheese" on the one hand, "gam" and "gold" on the other would seem to supply all the material necessary for

[1] Paul's Grundr. I. 838.

the discussion. The undue importance accruing to one dialect by the use of it as a norm appears in every direction in Middle English study; it may be illustrated from Kluge — "neben me. chetel 'Kessel' (= ae. ċetel [cytel would have been the abbstriate from to-quate] steht nicht palatisierles Ketel, das allerdings vielleicht aus dem Nord. (Ketill) erklärt werden kann." The reference is "allerdings" to "Nordischen"; the possibility of an Anglian cetel with unaffected c is not even suggested. On the other hand the value of seeking other dialects than the WS. in mind appears in such a work as ten Brink's Chaucers Sprache u. Verskunst which despite its apology for touching only the surface of the matter really by bringing into the comparison all the O.E. forms succeeds in displaying a tolerable consistency in the phenomena and leaves the reader with a

satisfactory sense of gain and progression and yet indeed less than is obvious observation in many cases due to the use of typical W.S. forms and not transition forms of late O.S. for example in the breakings and cases in which, in late W.S., there had been palatal umlaut.

To the second question regarding the exact value of the sounds at various times, there has not been in the remotest degree a definite answer given. Practically speaking from the orthography we can learn little or nothing, the absolute uniformity of the O.S. holds the student in check. Vowel change, the appearance of new diphthongs, variation between diphthongal and monophthongal forms, is the sole evidence and affords no very significant results. The determination of the earlier limit of the affection attracts comparative study, and latest attempts to prove a general palatalisation

for Anglo-Frisian, without winning belief. Kluge carries the palatalisation back to the Continent on the strength of palatalisation in umlaut forms stating that this gives us the "Älter der Palatalisierung", whereas palatalisation though original j and the subsequent development is so separate and simple a matter as hardly to merit more than a moment's attention; in treating of this he does not touch upon the matter of initial palatalisation and yet one of the first uses he makes of this introductory thesis is to infer a "zurückkehr" in the North, a reaction from č to k, for which there is not the slightest evidence.

As regards the simpler question of the determination of the actual character of the sounds, we are practically unable to learn anything by direct influence from accumulated material. That

h and g are spirants, very much alike, and that one tends to pure breath, the other to pure voice in certain positions. — This about sums all that the orthography tells us directly of W.S. conditions. There is no orthographic evidence of change and development — neither precise stage of palatalisation or relative amount of change. Two bits of evidence of this sort offered themselves in the case of c. One was the spelling of fetian as feccan and certain other words; these and certain current spellings in the Rule of St. Benet were seized upon as evidence that the palatal c was pronounced in W.S. like the modern tch, and in consequence in certain text-books we find the c marked as a sound of this character. Let us pause for a moment to examine the character of the evidence considered sufficient for such a conclusion. In the first place taking art. grund, of course apart from the disadvantages of h, & g.

Plat. J. A. VI. 179 cf. Sievers, § 195. 3 Logeman cf. Sievers A. XIII. 311-315

(if this be the original compound, or its popular form) we cannot suppose a change of tj to modern tch, for the sound to be expected would certainly be the usual eq, the voiced sound - the same holds true of every case adduced, except feccean, where the difficulty is really one of spelling, i.e: difficulty which disappears when it is remembered that the spelling is L.W.S. To reason from these cases to a general W.S. ch is as if some future philologian having accurately determined the sound of s in "sure" and "issue" should posit ch as the proper pronunciation of s wherever it occurs before u in the English of the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries.

Another apparent side-light upon c was the use of it to express a sound in loan-words supposedly ts. There is evidence of this in quite as great a number of words as of c=

= ch, and yet no one has been found sufficiently daring to maintain that c in O.E. represents an assibilated k. To return to them

This lack of evidence is surely to be regretted. It is barely possible that we may learn somewhat more from a detailed study of transition forms in late O.E. and early Middle English. Such a study may possibly in the case of the consonants, as it will be seen to do in the case of the vowels, lead us a step nearer to a full understanding of the transition from recorded forms in classic O.E. to those in Middle English.

Incidentally the character of the various notes and studies concerning palatalisation has been referred to. More careful detailed treatment has been given the subject in Sievers's Grammar, Sweet's History of English Sounds, and Klinge's Geschichte der englischen Sprache — apart from these there are only one or two treatises

ments of special sounds (as Ten Brink §3) and of special words and forms. These have only a most general bearing on the present study. In Middle English nothing has been done except bare record of fact in the study of individual texts and one survey of several texts not rising above a record of fact.[1] Many of the notes and remarks upon single words have been simply darkening of counsel. Even Kluge's article suffers from the discussion of special words, a method not unlikely to raise exceptions to the same plane of importance as the cases of typical development. Sweet's discussion of the subject is marred by a mistaken view concerning the initial g, and the palatal diphthong. Sievers's article in the Grammar really comprehends all we definitely know with regard to A. S.; and

[1] Förster, Zur Gesch. d. Gaumenlaute etc. Ten Brink's study of Chaucer is of course an exception

Sweet's Grammar and Ten Brink's study of Chaucer may be considered as the exception for Middle English.

In approaching the subject, it becomes at once apparent that the mere accumulation of material of all sorts and the attempt to ~~sort~~ arrange it into such a way as to afford a basis for generalisations would be worse than useless. It is not alone the simple fact that a method of this sort does away at once with all careful discrimination of dialectal differences but also the fact that freak-forms distract attention, or attract disproportionate attention.; yet again, for example, the character of the evidence with regard to such a point as the interchange of g and h would be hopelessly puzzling, and entirely discourage in the student from any hope of definite result. The necessity both in A.S. and in Middle English of a careful attention to dialectic differences, and the reduction of M.S. to

its proper place as a dialect among dialects. albeit the most important, was at once evident. It was plain that the study must strike out on some simple and direct line that would leave the unusual and exceptional at one side and afford a sure basis for a proper study and understanding of Middle English conditions on the one hand and of prehistoric conditions on the other.

The following lines of work seemed advisable:-

1. A dialectic study in A.S. of the characteristic texts.
2. A study of transitional forms in late W.S. and early Middle English texts - and with them of all stray forms of any sort from any part of the literature that may be of service.
3. A dialectal study of characteristic texts in Middle English.
4. A general study of the problem in Middle English with this the framing of full lists of words under

their proper rubrics, with a careful separation of the Romance element, and determination of its effect upon the native element.

Lists of this description would, it would seem simplify the whole question with a proper reading of the actual phenomena, as cleared, but recorded in the lists, in the light afforded by its previous special dialectic study.

A list of this sort, comprising however only words with regard to which there was full evidence, was made as an introductory step to the present paper, in order to ascertain if there was really the confusion and inconsistency which for one reason or another ~~had~~ the evidence as gathered and presented in various articles and notes seemed to indicate. The development of c and g before initial and medial a and its derivatives was the subject chosen — a being selected that would because of its position

midway in the scale, and because the exact effect of its i umlaut had been questioned by Kluge. The examples fell into line with beautiful regularity and even afforded a result not before recorded that æ was retained before all the breakings (using W.S. as the norm) except before -ear. This at once, in the most unmistakeable manner, suggests the familiar fact with regard to the dialectic distribution of the breakings in A.S. Yet again it was seen how few cases there are of the real palatal diphthongisation — less than a dozen which persist in Middle and Modern English. This emphasized the necessity of a most careful discrimination of the vowel standing in the neighborhood of the consonants under consideration — that all the breakings for example are not alike, or the palatal diphthong like the breakings

The first step then to the attainment of the fundamental facts, and the avoidance of doubtful and perplexing features seemed a dialectic study of the phenomena in A.S. — this, as a check to the tendency to ascribe too much importance to W.S., and in order to arrive at some exact notion of the character of the vowels with which the gutturals came into relation. It was thought that such a study would be simply an appropriation of material already gathered and thoroughly exploited, and that an advance might be quickly made to transition-forms and Middle English. But it was found on the contrary that while Sievers indicates with precision the general character of the phenomena met with, neither by him nor by others are significant facts hitherto emphasized, and that moreover of these points certain others do not

receive any explanation whatsoever. For example.

Palatal diphthongisation (initial) is a phenomenon with which the student of A.S. grammar becomes shortly familiar. Is the fact anywhere ever noticed that its occurrence might be considered dialectically characteristic of W.S. — in brief that over the greater part of English-speaking England, palatal diphthongisation, so far as the evidence of the texts goes to show, was hardly known, except after sc, and original j?

Palatal umlaut, we are told, is not characteristic of W.S. Are we anywhere informed why it is that a process which is the rule in the other dialects does not display itself in W.S. except in certain cases and there in a comparatively intensified form? (

Again, we are told of the ability of c and g to prevent u-o umlaut, but we are not

informed why it is that gutturals followed by gutturals have become so palatal as to prevent this guttural affection.

Breaking of æ, e occurs before h. h + cons. in W.S; this is therefore posited as general A.S.; we are told that the resultant conditions present difficulties, but these are not explained. The present study argues against the existence of this breaking in non-W. S.

The stock resultant of diphthongs of every character in W.S. is ie. In this it differs from the other dialects, but no explanation is given.

Such are the general questions for which the present study attempts to offer a single and it is to be hoped consistent explanation. A number of minor points are also touched upon and explained to which it is not necessary to call attention here. (see p. 84)

Initial Palatal Diphthongization.

The process of palatal diphthongization was generally as follows. A primary palatal affected a preceding c. or g. palatalised it, and as a result by reaction the vowel was broken into a diphthong, by an emphasisation, an accentuation of its palatal quality, has contrasted with a glide following of gutteral or less palatal character, which mediated the primary element with the preceding consonant. Such a diphthong was of course a falling diphthong: that it was of this character there is abundant evidence.

Sweet's mistaken argument with regard to the initial g sprang from his taking it for granted that the diphthong was a rising one. The g he says is a stop because we can understand (gaadan) becoming (ggaadan) but not (gaid) becoming

(jjaad) — except on paper.

Sweet should first explain why j is a fit symbol for the spirant ʒ even when palatal. The development is ǯaad, ǯaaad, ʒé-ad — the diphthong is a falling one, and the ʒ a spirant in accordance with the other evidence.

b and g. it is hardly necessary to remark become palatal, and react upon the vowel which palatalised them, only when that vowel is a primary palatal, æ, ǽ, e, é, i, í — even i being broken, though the rule for the others is that the accentuated palatal element in the new diphthong should be echoed by the palatal vowel next higher — æ > ea, e > ie etc. No reference of course is made to the guttural vowels in the following pages.

Two other sounds cause palatal diphthongisation — the one which may next be touched upon is sc. There seems to be

no reason why this should differ from example c, but the evidence seems to show that it possessed a palatal nature of its own evidenced by the fact that after it a glide is introduced before gutteral vowels. The existant and most plausible explanation of the fact would seem to be that there was levelling from the Koiné, the se being so marked and characteristic a combination. but this explanation appears to be unjustified for though the non-W.S. dialects were found se with the glide before gutturals and yet far from ~~characteristic~~ consistent introduction of the glide before palatals. If this glide was purely mediatory the diphthong might be a rising diphthong, until possibly, levelled to accord with the other diphthongs, all of which were falling

diphthongs.

In the next place with regard to the semi-vowel j— a notable sound when it is ~~to be~~ remembered that it is the only one of a palatal nature in initial position which A.S. derived from the Anglo-Frisian— the other palatal sounds in medial position being there caused by umlaut. Because of its essentially palatal nature we must needs suppose that the glide involved (as in the case of sc.) before guttural vowels was of a mediatory character, and that therefore the diphthong was of a ~~fo~~ rising diphthong. But here we may be certain that if this was primarily the cause, the influence of the other diphthongs was two strong, for we have clear evidence through variation of the Dynstol for the second element that the first element must have been the accented

element. Yet in Anglian, where diphthongs were comparatively rare, it seems possible that the rising diphthong might have been retained, at least in certain cases. It seems difficult to explain forms like gynd and gyre unless at a stage when the second element of these diphthongs. This is a transition from.
question however which Middle English developments must decide.

The following study shows that palatal diphthongisation is unusual and exceptional in non. W. S. It has been the fashion in case a word with c or g before a palatal initial, did not show ch. or y in becoming obedient to the rule, to set it aside at once as due to Scandinavian influence. But it would certainly seem as if there were scarcely necessary when we are entirely without evidence that c and g had

ever became so markedly isolated as to affect the following vowel in a way that required orthographic expression, [illegible] it was necessary, in the order of things for them to develop to ch and g. Sc and j are of course exceptions, and afford at once an answer to the objections that non-W.S. scribes may not have been in the habit of employing the diphthong taken although the sounds were like them of W.S.

One or two cases of apparent diphthongization are explained. The proof seems obvious in that non-W.S., initial consonants did not yield their gutteral quality so readily. Forms like cold and calf may be probably referred to Anglian cald. and calf, without the necessity of supposing Scandinavian influence.

The Northumbrian forms are more fully treated; after that simply the examples are given with the necessary comment.

Northumbrian.

The forms in the two texts under consideration — the Durham Ritual[1] and the Lindisfarne Gloss[2] — which exhibit palatal diphthongisation are of peculiar interest. The evidence with regard to c is not as abundant as might be wished; it is limited to the word ceaster; Of forms with g. sc. and original j. there are however plentiful examples.

The first point which attracts attention is the fact that the occurrence of the diphthong. indicating palatalisation, is only occasional. Forms with unaffected vowels, are decidedly more numerous. — so much so that forms with diphthongisation are to be considered as exceptional; a word will perhaps only in a single case exhibit the introduction of the glide. This is not merely a matter of orthography. There is markedly more frequent use of the glide in the case of sc. and uniform

[1] Lindelöf. [2] Lea.

discrimination of palatal quality in the case of original j. The conclusion is evident that there was no well-defined palatal diphthongisation, and the inference to be drawn is that, as compared with W.S., the consonants in question had not, in Northumbrian, advanced so far towards palatal quality.

A few examples may illustrate this. Thirty-six cases of giscæft appear in the Ritual beside one of gesceaft; four cases of -gæt (vb.) in the Glosses beside one of -geat. E remains unaffected in the Glosses, except in seven cases of gefa elsewhere found and in numerous cases only with e. In other words the balance is more even. Two cases of -gæf in the Glosses are balanced by two with the glide, -geæf, -geaf, and four of ongæegn by four of ongeagn.

The second point to be noticed is that this palatal diphthongisation is of late origin. This

fact is in the first place attested by the spelling ea (sceaftes etc. see list of examples). The lifting is not yet clearly defined and falls in with the WSax ea-type. It is shown in a still more notable way by the forms ætgeadre, gigeadriga, geadrung etc. These and other forms of the same stem appear - even where as in W.S. palatal diphthongisation is the rule — with the æ undiphthongised.

The development of these words is so exceptional and they differ so markedly in their lack of variant forms both in the Glosses and the Ritual, that they call for a special explanation. The word geafel (Gen. xii. 14) affords a key to the problem. In treating of u-o umlaut (§ 16) Lea says "the form geafel. ... = W.S. gafol, is probably not an exception to [the] rule [that u is not affected] but an example of the influence of a preceding palatal". Miss Lea, while justified in her remark concerning the u-o umlaut

of a, forgets that to assume palatal influence she must assume that the a of this word had become æ, and that this æ had so influenced the g, as to cause a resolution of the æ into ea. But the a of gaeful could not possibly have become æ. That this diphthong is due to the initial g is impossible.

A more probable explanation is to be found in the nature of the u-o umlaut. Its effect is to resolve the palatal vowel of a preceding syllable into two elements, palatal and guttural, a result necessarily followed by a dissimilative process tending to accentuate the palatal quality of the stressed element. It is this which takes place in the u-o umlaut of a in Mercian Rs. — *stadal > *staadol > *steadol, written steadol. Now it is true that in North., u-o umlaut of a does not occur, but its equivalent within certain limits is certainly the rule, and it is certain that a stands on the

[1] Except in compounds, see p. 47

boundary-line. If as here we are bound to believe that a has submitted to this affection, we must look for a special reason in the particular word in question, and if such is found may be justified in assuming the exception. That special reason is naturally to be looked for in the character of the consonant preceding the a. In the case before us, it is a ʒ. The explanation will then be that while the stops and other spirants guard the integrity of the following vowel, this more unstable sound, always peculiarly sensitive to palatal affection, cooperates in the process by which the a is diphthongised by adapting itself to the palatal quality of the first element of the resulting diphthong. In this way accordingly we get geafol, and, similarly, the forms geadr ... geadre, geadriga, geadrung etc. It is difficult to see how geafel could be otherwise explained, and the uniformity in both text of all the forms of geador [illegible]

clear as contrasted with the variation shown by other words.

To return to our discussion of the late origin of the diphthongization — the two forms scieppend and scæppend in the Ritual merit discussion. They occur beside sceppend and scepend. Now it is quite in accordance with North. conditions that the e of these latter forms represents the i-umlaut of ea, but if an historic ea is to be assumed for these forms, why is it not found universally after sc? It seems clear that the e rather represents simply the i-umlaut of æ, and that is, the forms is the palatal diphthongisation of the e. That is we have variation here precisely similar to that which we find in gefa.

Let us glance now at the evidence as it concerns the particular sounds.

The only example of c is ceaster, ceastra. This shows no variant forms.

I appears, followed by palatal diphthongisation, in -geaf, -geaf beside two cases of -gaf, and gaat beside four cases of gaat, and in geagn, four cases, beside four of gagn. Geafol and the forms of -geadr- have already been discussed. Palatal diphthongisation of e is lacking; e appears as i in seven cases of gefa (see list of examples). We are not warranted in supposing the e practically equivalent to ie, for we may suppose the scribe would have used ie, had the diphthongal quality been well defined, just as he used it in sciephend and as the scribe of the Glos used it in bigieindra (ultra).

Sc stands apart. It seems to have assumed palatal quality irrespective of the following vowel. We cannot here determine whether the palatal sound levelled through from cases with palatal vowels to cases with guttural vowels, for that would imply a consistency in the diphthongisation of the palatal vowels which we do not find. (See examples). But

because of the introduction of the glide before gutturals, we must necessarily assume its essentially palatal nature at this time, even though it has not yet effected a general and clearly defined diphthongisation of the vowels which follow it.

For original j, see above p. 24, and list of examples.

To conclude — palatal diphthongisation in North. was merely sporadic. It is in fact doubtful whether St. Liphtlang, where it occurred, was to of pronouncedly palatal character as regards its first element as in the W.S. The North. displays here its preference for labial and guttural character and its avoidance of diphthongs. The Middle English evidence will make this clear; cf. Northern caf, caff. Midland chaff. Southern cheve, Northern gef, geef. Southern yef, etc. Kluge's hypothesis of a return from palatal to guttural conditions in the North is simply an assumption. Vowels and consonants, which show a retention of primitive conditions on the one hand, and a consistent development in Middle English on the other, the pass seems to the examples.

Northumbrian Ritual.

æ :– gæto (portas) 18.20; gætto 124.4; gættana 59.11; begætt, 91.1; gigegnæt (obviabit – cf. p.).

giscæft' 103.16; scæft 68.14; giscæft 97.5 (36 cases beside gescæft 146.10); ascæccenum 37.2 (beside ascæccan 57.3); ; (with umlaut) scæppend 65.7, scepend 33.7 (beside scieppend 146.10, scippend 99.7).

Note :– The a of organn 45.8 remains before the naval. bald 192.11.14, calf 21.6, galga 23.18 retain a before l + cons. balic 115.1 and stancarr 19.11 are loan-words.

æ > ea :– ceaster, 11.1 etc. (6);

-geadr-. 39.19 etc. (7)

gesceaft, 146.10 (beside 36 cases without diphthongization, see above); asceaccen 59.3; sceall 115. Rubric 2; sceare 124.2; bryd sceaw' (thoro.– Lindelöf suggests that this is for sceonne). 116.1.

G:- In the case of e. as Lindelöf points out, there is in general no diphthongisation. Among numerous forms of gefa, geta, geld-, etc., there are only seven of gefa which seem to evidence the influence of initial palatal :-

gife 30.5, 71.13; gifende 71.6; forgif 66.15; forgifnisse 41.20; 46.11; etc. (3).

These are so few among so many that it at first suggests itself to ascribe them to scribal error, perhaps as due to the prevalence of the gi- prefix — but there can be no doubt that under this heading must be included the forms

scieppend 145.10, scippend 99.7

and with these the gefa forms would be comparable. Lindelöf classes there as i umlaut of ea, but it must be remarked that ie is not found in Northumbrian as umlaut of ea — in fact these cases and ondsciene 55.6 (îe) are the only cases which occur in the text. The usual form would be that given above. scieppend 65.7, scapend 35.7

No other form occurs with original æ. except æcled, 92.9. and that does not exhibit diphthongisation.

Âe :- W.S. âe. North. ê is not diphthongised : ongeton 2.4. For W.S. scêap, Rit. has scîp 9.17, 27.19 etc., in which the i plainly indicates palatal affection.

Here reference may be most fittingly made to the form geæt. 92.10 to which Luickelöf refers as a case of diphthongisation. despite its long vowel. It is certainly to be considered rather as an uncontracted form with anomalous spelling j compare bigaat 27.20 etc. gaat 12.11 etc.

The cases remaining to be listed are of æ before guttural vowels: -

â - êa: gisceadas 36.13, gisceadest 16.2, 31.8 etc scean 58.3 etc.;

o - eo; sceoma, 27.16; 102.6; etc; sceondlic, 24: 18.

ô - êo; sceoh, gisceo. 58.6, gisceop 55.16 etc.

Note. A very curious feature of the Ritual and Rushworth, is the form in which the verb gangan appears - geonga. 26.9 etc., giongu 37.3 etc., It is impossible to refer this so to palatal influence the forms are possibly modelled by popular etymology on a supposed ge-ongan.

Original j.

Original j appears as i in proper names — jacob 63.4, iosep 194.3 etc. — in iocce (jugo) 108.10, and the curious form iiocc 109.16. It appears as gi gie, in gie (pronoun) 3.16; 5.1; gie (jam) passim and gieondfar (inlustra) 15.5. Ge appears for gea in ger 99.5 etc. as in L. W. S. (cf. Sievers, §102. and Note)

-ndelif finds difficulty in two forms, - geuingo 111.5, Le cayo. shows an early stage of the dipthongization while gigot. 97.6 etc., shows one far advanced, and one which is not satisfactorily clear to him.

Ide evidently considers the gi of gegon equivalent to ge, whereas it is presumably equivalent to gio — the o having disappeared before the following g.

[1] Cf. Paul Beiträge VI. 42 with regard to Mercian Ps., 118.9. Zinz(ra)

Lindisfarne St. Mark (Lea, §§ 28–31)

æ:– agæf. xii. 1; xv. 37 (cf. –gæf. x. 4, –geaf xv. 15); ongægn xii. 41 etc. (4 cases, cf. geægn x. 1. 2. 4 cases) gæt (sb.) i. 33, –gæt (vb.) xv. 45 etc. (4 cases beside –geat v. 30)

æcræftes x. 6 (æcræftes xiii 17, þ cræfte, vi 15).

æ > ea :– ceastra, i. 45 etc.

geafol xii. 14, ætgeadre ii. 15. etc.; –geæf x. 4, –geaf xv. 15; geægn x. 1. 2. etc., –geat v 30.

æceacas, vi. 11, æceacerum x. v. 7, æceafte xvi. 15; æceal x. 17; xiii. 7; æcealt x. 21; mor. æceaſe xv. 11, 15. 27; æcræftes xiii. 19.

Note. The forms of geægn, geægn. are included here, as the quality of the initial g (whether or no original j or still equivalent phonetically to original j) may be considered open to question. The character of the vowel moreover is rendered dubious by its position between the two gs, cf. p.

Ê :- Ê is unchanged except in gyld (st.) Pref. 4. xxxviii (beside geldas xii. 17 etc.). The form is for North. conditions anomalous, but is presumably due to the labial. In the Ps. despite the entire lack of palatal diphthongisation just such an isolated case occurs. - gilden 196. 25.

Â :- tosceande, v. 4.

Sc. with guttural vowels.

â > êa :- tosceadade iv. 34 etc.

o > eo, ea ;- sceonfulnisse vii. 21 etc ; sceortum Pref. i. 13 : 5, xl-vi ; scealde x, 32, xiv. 40

ô > êo :. geosceop xiii. 19.

Gongan :- geonga occurs 35 times in the present forms of the verb, - and in the subst. geongas, i. 3, v. 13 etc. (6).

Original j.

Original j appears as i in proper names – jácobes xv. 40, jórdane, x. 1, etc. – elsewhere as g. ge. gi: – brgrenda x. 1. (before u) gie (pronoun) ii. 8 etc., ge i. 17 etc., gê x. 36 etc., geê xiv. 64, gee (jam) viii. 2, etc., giee xv. 44, gigorle x. 20, ging xiv. 51, xvi. 5.

Fr W. S. giet, we ham get viii. 17. 21 etc., jet iv 46. Similarly, with o glide before u. geone v. 35 etc.

Mercian.

Psalter. c and z.

"Eine einwirkung der palat. auf den folgenden vokal ist in Ps. so gut wie gar nicht zu spüren" (Zenner. §40.1). Only one case of apparent heightening occurs - zelden 196.25 beside numerous other cases of the same word and other words with e. (cf. above p.). For cases of æ without diphthongisation after c and z note ceester, 86.3. 121.3 etc; zet (porta) 117.20; ongzet (praet.) 48.13 etc. (Also after sc there is no diphthongisation except that due to i-mutation or breaking; westemsceat 54.12 (§ 39) Zenner explains as due to the plural forms, and the form scire 71.15, 70.6 is doubtful.

Original j (§ 27)

Original j appears as i in proper names — iacob 77.5, jordan 113.3.5 etc. — and in simple

cf. Paul. Beiträge VI. 39.

67.26; 118.141; inzra 183.3; inzuda 42.4; 128.2; (zuinda 24.7).

It appears as ze only in zeond 188.25 etc., zeondzan 100.2 etc. zeamrunz 6.7

Before n, it appears as z:- zunze 77.63 etc. zunzra 36.25, zunzesta 67.28. zuzud (MS. zudud) 102.5, zuinda 24.7. zuzuda 10.5 etc. (zuzuda 87.16. The comparative forms however zinzrum 148.12, zinz(ra) 118.9, are to be noted; Paul (Beiträge 11.42) regarded this as a contraction of io, iu, in which case the zu would have to be considered as equivalent to zu or zeu. Considering the retention of eo before r+cons.+j (§8) this view is to be considered doubtful; although to be sure in several cases before r, i is found. If the pronunciation of this combination were really zeu. or zeo. one might certainly expect to find indication of it in the forms without umlaut. The simpler explanation seems to be that the i is the umlaut

of e, which occasionally occurs as i, — cf. § 11.

Before palatal vowels, j appears simply as ʒ:- ʒe (goth. jus) 2.12; etc; ʒet 36.10 etc: ʒif. 7.4 etc.

W. S. ʒear appears as ʒer, 76.6 etc.

Zeuner adduces in proof that the ea. eo after the ʒ are true diphthongs, the word ʒeamrungʒ, beside ʒemrungʒ(e) 37.10 etc. The form to be expected in the Ps. would be ʒeomrunz — and the appearance of ea, and its contraction to e would best indicate a falling diphthong.

Rushworth 2. (Brunn § 8)

Despite the mixed character of this text, it may be worth our while to glance at its testimony.

Ae:- caastr-, 2.23 etc. (13 cases beside caastr-. 21. 10 etc. 5 cases), gaafel, gaafl- 5.46 etc., gaagn-, 8.28 34 etc., aatgaedre, gegaadrade 19.6. etc., aal 11.4 (41 forms with aa, 13 ea, 8 eo, 6 a); aeal 3.14 etc; Deade, 4.16; ascâked 10.14; fotscamel 5.35; aare 26.55 etc.

Forms with ea to be added to those mentioned are ceaf 3.12, geatt 7.13 etc, ofersceatta 25.29

E:- There is no palatal diphthongisation of e.

It will be seen that forms without diphthongisation are numerous. Particular attention is attracted to the forms gaafel, gegradaade, in connection with the argument advanced above in explanation of their occurrence with diphthongisation in North., since Brunn lists several cases of e-o umlaut of a (§14 a) and it might be urged that here we should logically expect

similar diphthongisation. But it must be remembered that these forms are normal, apart from the æ in gæfel, which is probably due to lengthening by the g rendered possible by its use in the palatalised form gæfel. Incidentally it may be mentioned that Brown's list of cases of u-o umlaut of a is open to criticism. The list narrows to hearge 21.33 (acc. sing. = hagan). Ondsweorde. 16.17. looks more like the andsworian of the Ps. or a compromise of that and the other form in the Ps. andsworian. Eosull 21.5, eosula 21.7, Oosul 21.2 (asellus) is decidedly dubious as regards the original character of the unlaunted vowel. Both cases have eo, not éa, and it is to be remarked that elsewhere this diphthong invariably comes from e.

Original j:- This shows its usual variation,- ioc 11.29.30. iungæ 19.23, in monnum 5.27; gu-monnum 5.27 etc., geond 4.23 etc.

' Not stable enough known to permit diphthongisation.

Kentish.

Still further evidence is afforded by the Kentish with regard to the sporadic character of palatal diphthongisation. The texts used are the Kentish Charters, so-called, the Epinal and Corpus Glosses with some reference to the Erfurt, the Vespasian, Regius, and (so-called) Junius Glosses of Cod. Cott. Nero. D. VI.

The Charters. (Wolff)

The mixed dialectic character of these documents need not concern us if the evidence they present is consistent. Wolff divides those he uses into four groups, A. those presumably pure Kentish B.1. Mercian-Kentish, B.2. Saxon-Kentish. C.1. those from Surrey, C.2. four which he decides to be South Mercian, perhaps from localities near the Kentish border.

Here admitted for purposes of convenience in spite of its Mercian colouring.

Wolff gathers together (§7) the forms which in his opinion display palatal affection due to an initial palatal.

A (these documents presumably pure Kentish).

æ > ea :— -geate, 7.26; 7.28; ongean 7.28.

There is no evidence of palatal c. Wolff erroneously adduces mythercaap II. 314.15, since ceap < * kaup-

æ :— Ecaester- 251.27; 282.18; Riverscape 10.4, begæt 575.11, 583.15; Gæmbald 132.18; Jæmberhtus 276.1, 318.1, Jæmberhti 402.3.

Only in the cases after j is there any possibility of the æ indicating distinct palatal affection from the consonant, since æ is not æ might be expected before the nasal as in Jumbertus 338.4, 406.3.

i :— scol 360.8, gefe 362.10.20, 376.22, centre II. 201.31 etc. Kent 576.5; Scaldes Forde 522.27 etc.

Ceast is of course included by error; the e is due to i-umlaut. That the e in these examples is for æ (even that in ceastre, though the document is dated 889) is unmistakeable, — cf. list of other cases p. 2. Scel is for scael and gefe for gæfe, a well-attested form of giefu. Wolff parallels with Scelden the 12th century forms Scealdesford 524. 16. 18. Since the e of Scelden is for æ, Sweet's statement stands corrected that for the change of *ald to *eald, we have no evidence of an intermediate ald.

Over Wolff's examples of ie Rouescieastre 88. 7, 124. 28 — it is not necessary to linger. The form though occurring in a document dated 696 is plainly Middle English. It is to be noted that the first of Wolff's references 88. 7 does not occur. As the other reference 124. 28 is to be found in the 88th document, 7th line,

it is evident that Wolff has entered the case as two through a change in his system of enumeration.

Are these cases Wolff evidently regarded as due to the palatal quality of the initial consonant for he says that in the following "a ist unverändert geblieben": Burgte. 8.27 Renegatum 272.20, etc., caping II. 314.17 Scaga 317.17. Jambertus. 338.4, 406.3. It is difficult to see how the a of caping could have done otherwise than remain unaltered.

It is to be observed that we have fluctuating evidence regarding geat (two cases of ea to Three with 2). It is possible that the sporadic retention of the ea in Non-W.S. forms may be due to the influence of i-umlaut in the oblique forms and in nom. plural, and that the dominating form was really geat This would explain, without calling in Scandinavian influence, the extreme rarity of the Southern Middle English geat.

73. . Sceaga 258.26

Hrofeceaster 358.23; Ceaster ceaeta 421.6; Jaegu-laad 358.29: Hrofeceaster 352.21; 474.8; Sceaga 358.28

The form Sceaga 258.26 only calls for attention. The ea is presumably due to the influence of ga working in combination with the sc (for a similar of a with c.g intervening cf. - leagu 142.8, 364.23, reacol 462.10, § 13) since the word has no right to ea, and a fortiori no other example of sceaa occurs in the Charters or in fact in any of the texts except Psalm 53 geceaft (beside Hymn geceaft 17.33.).

B. 2. Geanberht 337.13; geat 337.2; geate II. 458. 16 17.17.19;

scal II. 109.1 (XI. century); Racuelceastre 337.26 gatan 337.2, II. 132. 13.14.

These Saxon-Kentish forms, particularly as they are most of them late 9th century, do not merit close attention

with the exception of gatan II. 132. 13. 14, and precisely for the reason that it is Saxon-Kentish and late (862).

C. 1. schal 57.40, parkesgate 58.11, gate 58.12.

The reader may be pardoned for surprising particularly these forms with some surprise, as they are grumbly listed by Wolff from a document dated in his preface 675. The forms themselves should have been sufficient to indicate that they belong in a late addition to the deed to which they appear to belong, but it is especially amusing to find just above two of them, the name of "Sire Geffreus Herde de la Croix."

[1] For a similar error, cf. p. 52 where Wolff says "In den Urkunden kommt keine Abweichung vom ea, ausser in C. 1." These "abweichungen" are: — stone 58. 20, one 58.8, choten 58.10! He here also forgets that he has noted three cases of â becoming ea after palatal g.

ole English, though occurring in a document dated 696; it is probabl

a correction or emendation of some later date. ~~Be it observed by~~ ~~co~~

The examples with æ, cneean, -æete, occur in the same documen

Over against these are to be balanced cases of æt initial and in co

position, the form hæpt, and æfe, equivalent to æfe, a form of

~~diphthong occurs both with and without the following~~ diphthong

It is impossible of course in the case of such documents to ~~ap~~

ply satisfactorily any test as to uniformity of spelling. ~~The most~~

that can be said is that in one document Sæcli- is found hea

But it may be assumed that in general palatal diphthong, if ex

isting to any general ~~degree~~ in sufferer, was not strong enough to

meet with uniform orthographic ~~representation~~.

The forms in ē need no comment. In E.S. it will be seen

æet occurs beside æt- in the same line of the same document, ar

ing license in spelling.

As regards the forms lænten by Kölbl under ~~"~~

The Glosses: (Dieter §27)

Dieter finds no cases of initial dehiphongisation. The exceptional sceaba 226 23 (853); -sceadan 186 18 (no reference given by Sweet) he explains as due to u-o umlaut. The form gibaan 126 37 (525) owes its i in Dieter's opinion to the special Kentish Leightening assumed by Zupitza (Z. f. d. A. XXX×1.6). It seems scarcely necessary to do this. Considering the gebon, gefon of Erf. and Corp., a simpler explanation would be that the form is due to scribal error, through prevalence of the prefix gi-, which occurs 40 times, to 16 of ge.

Both Ep. and Corpus show palatal dehiphongisation in unstressed syllables. Dieter says this occurs (§44) more frequently a j originally fol-

I affix references to Sweet, O.E.T., after Dieter's, which are to Sweet, Wright, and Behler for the three glosses respectively.

lowed a palatal sound, and he cites gimaengiungiae 7 d 35 (203) mengio 15 b 36 (659), locas 15 b 21 (746) b[illegible]a 24 b 13, 14 d 6 (771.121) But, he says, it also occurs after an originally simple guttural — and he quotes, gemengiungiae 7 d 35 a second time, together with birciae 19 f 25 (792), hringiae 76 31 (410) (beside rhingae 13 d 2 (552)), cistigian 14 d 22 (—), scinlaecean 16 b 28 (681).

Corpus, he says, shows dipthongisation only in the first case:- gemengiunge 14.17, (522), hnaegiuing 25.33 (1024), geltingio 6.24 (159), gescincio 20.45 (816); reccco 5,21 (—) arecio 20.42 (—); fraetgingian 6.19 (183)

With the exception of one or two forms difficult in themselves, the i in all the cases, irrespective of Dieter's division either represents a remnant of original j or is carried over from verbal forms with j.

Psalm :– forðgescæft 53; scame 64

Hymn :– gescæft 17.33, ceastre 19

Zupitza Gloss (Zupitza, p.7) :– "es zeigt sich nie
la durch Einfluss eines vorhergehenden y
oder æ.

ę :– No cases of diphthongisation occur in any of the documents.

â (< Germ. e) (Wulff. § 39)

The Charters: e is the rule :– gore 560.7 etc. (6) scep 576.4. cesses 562.15(3). Âe occurs in scâep 459.3, scâepa 575.21. cæses 459.24, cæsa 459.25. This testimony is inconsistent as there is frequent interchange of ê and â.

Two cases however – geare II. 107.19.20, cyses II. 107.2 attract special attention. All three are in the same docu-

Wulff classed gefe 562.10 under the vowel a: he not only gives it here a second time, but adds two cases of the same word gæfe 459.6.16 – with æ – which he did not give under the a rubric at all – not to speak of agafe 459.33, also here given.

document. Had Wolff examined this document more closely, he could not have failed to remark that though it is a grant to St. Augustine's Abbey at Canterbury of the rent from land at Brabourne, Kent, yet in its linguistic character it differs markedly from the other documents accepted as Kentish. For instance aside from the the uniform breaking of a before l + cons., h + cons., and the absence of palatal umlaut, it is to be remarked that there is no interchange of e and æ, ê and ê̂, that y occurs constantly for i and î and ie, and that we find here the forms hyrnum (= hreig) and wudes (wo and wor are elsewhere rare. The single form in any degree characteristically Kentish is gere II. 166.28, geres II. 167.19 and that is balanced by the two forms of geare cited above. We know this document to be late -860- within the time of W. S. dominion: it is indubitably W. S. in its forms.

That is - it is always a possibility in Kentish.

It is difficult to understand why Wolff, quoting it as we have seen and listing it with his purely Kentish documents should also have omitted to note the cases of agyfe, agife (two each) which it contains. He says nothing of these when treating of "e after a palatal." They form another bit of evidence in support of the conclusion just reached. They are here especially mentioned as pointing to an interesting form in Document No 403. (I. 560) which appears to be (in part at least) an earlier form of the grant just considered. A number of interesting forms appear in this earlier form of the grant - hlaba, cesa, weada, erbum, dochter. The document has been dated 831. 832. Certainly on the linguistic evidence, it would seem to be very much earlier - with the exception of a clause added (with a cross prefixed) between the first and second paragraphs. This clause contains the forms hlafe, saule, as contrasted with the hlaba, sawale elsewhere used. For the main body agyfe. II. 106 B; 107.3, agife II. 107. 19. 21

today of the document the evidence would point to the 8th century.

The form of particular interest referred to is a-giaban (560.8). This form also, strangely enough, has been passed over by Wolff. If accepted as it stands, it would be a solitary instance in support of early diphthongisation of the e. But precisely because it is isolated — and because of the occurrence of eea and gere in the same document — the form is to be ascribed to scribal error or misprint.

To return to Germ. â — the evidence of the Glosses and Psalm are consistent:— Epinal, geri 494, gerlicae 94, Corpus, gere 1028, gerlice 170. Ps. Vegetius 58. Zupitza Gloss: "scaar[858], elsewhere e". The form is not scaar but scer; Wolff omits gel 442!

Braun under the heading of â after palatals cites Zupitza (4.5) "die Kt. Gl. haben 13 mal ę (= æ) somit e. Zupitza is speaking of the vowel in general not after palatals. Wolff follows Braun in the citation

Â (< ai) remains unchanged in all the documents except in asceaden II. 167.6, sceaded 467.38 gesceaded II. 132.18: — Charters: - gastas 446.11, gaste 576.11; Poulm - gaste 38 163, gastre 146 etc. Hymn: - gastes 12 etc; Zupitza Glos (p.8): - "nach dc bleibt â in allen vorkommenden fällen gescâdad 246, toscâd 1134, gescâd 1164.

It is notable that the three exceptions to the rule occurring in three separate documents should all be forms of the same word.

To conclude: - the only cases of palatal diphthongisation after c and g in the Kentish documents are three, all in the same document, - two of geate, one of ongean. The document is dated 604; Opposed to the two cases of geat are three, all in different documents, the earliest of which bears the date 605. All the examples with c are without diphthongisation

The Saxon-Kentish documents have four cases of geat to

-four of -gat-.

Diphthongisation occurs in lengthened syllables in the Epinal and Corpus, as in W.S., where a j originally followed, the first element representing a remnant of that original j, preserved while palatalising the preceding guttural.

Sc, as noted, only in three or four examples is followed by diphthongisation.

The following facts may be noted with regard to orthography:— K here as elsewhere over the entire field appears for c, — particularly before æ (-ii); examples occur every commonly in the Charters; in Corpus, kiğlle 7.25 (), kaldid 27.43 (1117) Epinal kech 8/11.26 f37 (233), in ch appears for c in Corpus, challes ? 5.15 (), and elch 51.36 (433) cornoch 25.3 (495). This latter occurs beside cornuc 25.3 (496), warranting us in the belief that ch indicates a stop only. In Charters dich 57.16', scild-wich 337.23'. Zu appears for cu both in Corpus and ' Not referred to by Wolff.

Epinal ; in the latter text with but one exception. These
spellings afford no aid in our problem.

Original j :-

Before guttural vowels, says Wolff, (§60) an e only seldom appears. The examples he gives, are gioc 584.2
Godgyreesham 27[illegible].33

Wolff says these are the "few" examples. His statement does not give the essential facts in the matter, which is that j appears as a rule in Latin forms, when it is naturally spelled J: Jaenberhtus 276.1. 318.1, Jamberhti 402.37, Jamberhtus 338.4, 406.3; B.1. Jaegnlaad 358.29. Here also is to be mentioned the form Jaenbald 132.38, and most certainly he should not have omitted Jeanberht 337.13, though it appears in the group B.2. The forms Joiled 462.5, Jocleta II. 158.6, Jocled 449.15, Joclet 476.19, 477.1, he mentions only in § 33 under u. In brief his statement is entirely misleading. The only case of j before a guttural

vowel without the glide is Groen. Od 132.38, and here we have the digraph. That [illegible] state of the case is precisely what it is elsewhere; with the exception of this example, j before a guttural vowel when it is spelled with a g is followed by diphthongisation; when spelled with an i the simple vowel follows.

Finally Wolff makes no mention under j of the various forms of gere, 560.7.18, 562.13, etc. This form in L.W.S. represents a contraction of geare, but it is certainly open to question whether here, and in Mercian, it does not simply represent *jaer, without diphthongisation.

In Epinal, (Dieter §31) no examples occur of j before a guttural vowel. Corpus has regularly geveboga 1.13 (15), geve. etecca 3 S. 21. (1424), geondsmead 19.23 (—), giululing 11?.36. (c.19). The only cases of i for j are Epinal. cesca 15412, (1955), Corpus iccessuras 11.9 (—), [illegible] 26.24 (—)

West Saxon.

The scattered cases of diphthongisation in Anglian were classed under the affected vowels In treating the W.S., since there is no exception to the diphthongisation, it will be more convenient to take up the separate consonants in order.

The texts are then handled by Sweet — the Cura Pastoralis, Orosius, Chronicle. For brevity and for the sake of ease of comparison, his notation is adopted: — the Cura Pastoralis is simply cited by number, the Orosius by a cipher prefixed to the number, and the Chronicle is mentioned by name. For our purposes it will not be necessary to indicate correspondences of the texts of the C.P.; we shall simply indicate difference if it occurs.

As before said palatal diphthongisation is the rule. We first take up diphthongisation in stressed syllables, and then separately that in unstressed: —

to.

Cosijn for a moment perplexes his reader by his statement regarding palatal c ( ). "Die palatale tenuis", he says "wird vor a, o, durch cc, vor u durch cu angedeutet" (PBB, p. 7). From his examples does one learn that he is speaking of unstressed syllables. Nothing is said under the c-rubric regarding c initial in stressed syllables. For this we must turn back to his treatment of æ on p. 7, where we are told that "W. S. æ aus altem a wird nach palatalem g, c, und sc, wie vor h, r + cons., w. zu æ, ea, ... gæ, cæ, scæ. werden zu gæa, cæa, scæa. wo-raus gea, cea, scea".

The examples are:- ceaf 369.9, ceaster 163.12, ciefes 0282.2, ciele 285.10 (cf. Kelnes 307" gecelan 309.7) ciele 447.6, cierre 235.24 (cf. becerran 175.5 etc., cirran 57.10 etc.). Other cases of c (e.g. mit u) do not occur.

'ciefes, ciele, and cierran are not included by Cosijn under this rubric

Carn 072.21 has its familiar by-form cearn. 3029 (Hallen.), but in oblique cases OHi. seeming exceptions are loan-word, -gecafetrod, calendas. carcern.

K for c:- akenned 313.20, Kenninge 97.10, se Kena 218.16, Kelnesse 307.11, se Kok 461.12, 459.32 Kokke 459.29 etc. (cocces 461.1) akolige 150.1, Kyc(g)lum 297.1, Kyning 18 times Halt. 24 Exod. 5 Chron. Kynehades 32[20], Kynerices 7.18, Kynestole 39 17, Kynelic 84.10 etc., Kynn 85.18 etc., Kyp-lum 149.8 etc., Kyban 2.2 etc., Kraeft 152.5 aker 411.18, ceake 105 17.21, gioke 197.8, 201.22, rake 193.15, ascoke 311.15, cakiad 163.8, murk-cin 467.18, fordikigeh) 361.4 etc., Kokke (vide supra) dicke 329.19, ceak 105.13, Kok 461.12. (in foreign wrds.) Karcernen 204.12, Kylle 469.9.10 (cylle 076.32) Kynnen 439.28 Kniat 603.11 etc., anker 445.12

Of inversion of K for C medially the Ruthwell Cross furnishes a parallel

It will be noted that this k appears where we should expect the guttural k (except possibly fordikigean ?) Its preference for the vicinity of o and particularly for that of u is noticeable, just as in the Runic inscriptions and in fact in Middle English.

By :-

æ > ea :- greaf 41.22 etc., ongeat 33.15 etc., begeat 0112.10, geate 383.2.8. 088.31 etc. (even in nom. acc. plu. and dat. plu. geata 072.13, 0100.31, geatum 0222.6; Corpus suggests influence of a w (u), swegegn 111.10, ongean 271.4 etc; Ts. geanes 88.18 etc.; gieriela 87.19 etc; giriela 411.35; giestes, 125.8.

The ea of gearo is of course through influence of the oblique forms. The forms godricum, gafol, gangan may simply be mentioned for the sake of contrast with the North. forms.

e > ie ;- ongretan 23.7,21; 048.30; etc.; ongitom

19.4, 0104.3 etc.; giefu 57.4 etc.; giefu 257.20 – giefan 45.4 etc.; gifan, 284.16; gifl hæm) 145.9 etc.; giem (m) 85[5] etc (gim 84.5);

These seem the cases for g. Cosijn notes that the single case byfjan 73.4 is against numerous others without e, is without significance.

Sc:

Cosijn's momentarily perplexing remark concerning palatal c, that it is indicated by a glide e before a and o, and an i before u, does not of course apply to stressed syllables and presumably, he did not intend to imply that palatal c never did occur initially before guttural vowels. But his remark very clearly caused the confusion in appearing in the statement concerning sc, giving the impression that "sc" followed a rule identical with that of c, thereby

[illegible] ac. [illegible] genres [illegible] line graphisk. [illegible] engelandsk [illegible] set." Having committed himself previously to a statement in which the difference between a stressed and unstressed syllable is left out of account, he is evidently now at loss to understand why æc does not run in accordance with his definition of c – why it has e before a r o, and yet no "glide" before n. He cannot call the sound palatal; at best he can only say that it is an "undersklant".

æ > eæ > ea (gathered passim) :– æcat 339.10.11 etc., unscearf full, 331.15 etc., æcare 139.25 etc., æcuræax 138.13, æcæft 295.17 etc.; æcal 9.22. etc: (æcel 125.4, 325.17, æcol 062.9, 0100.15. æcęl 0246.27); æcabb 71.3.4.9 (classed here by Cosijn though the a is before bb); æcæcad 135.19 (corrected in Hattem); æcæden 243.23 etc; æc(e)amian 101.5 etc (beside æcamm, æcomm.

æromian etc.; ; æc(e) and ,87' etc.; æc(e)nd 73.15 etc.; geæeapan 201,12 etc; æeonca 122.11 ,etc.; to-æeiad 34.2 b, to-æeat 153.1' etc., æeap 43.5 etc., æearum 139.14; æci(e)p. fend (reference not given); æiell 361.18.

ie : æield' ,431.5, 0276.15 (æild 239.9. æeld 0188.25. 0230.24) æeiran 139.12 eo; iu-æe(e)oriad 57.12 etc; geæeah 261.5. 319.1 etc.; æeôgead 44.9; æeolon 61.17 etc.; æeolan 080.35; æiolde 77.11; æioldon 346.13 æeoldon 9.19, 078.18 etc.; æeolde 0166.14.30; [illegible] 604.

The tendency of æc to palatal quality independent of its following is evident – it appears noticeably in the fact that æc shares with original j the power to break æ, and in the introduction of e. i. before o.

Original j: – The usual conditions present themselves. "Probably influence of ie, as a typical d[illegible] thing in the MSS.

Selreo: i in foreign names. - Jeremias 132.9, mint Lof 0186[18], etc., except as below.; in native words, viz 3[3] 212[24], Ia iungan 13.28 etc., or iugurle 207.11 to 213.24, iongum 385.10

G before i and e; - -ge- ge- 3[3]83[10], ge gie ge nise 308.9, git 17.19(H) 16.19 (C);

Gi in; giet, ~~giet~~ 5[15] etc; Gi(e)ltuno 131.12

Before guttural vowels:- Geowearda 0528. etc. (Juguetta); gear 044.19 etc, gér 07 10.22 etc., gro, 2.3, giocda 71.11; giogurhade- 355.34 giugurhade 385.32 etc:, geoke 197.8 etc geoke 196.8 211.22, geoig, 175.13 etc., geongra 387.34; geong jeungan 178.21; geigeui, 691, 190 etc.; geonrlic 0166.15

palatal c and g in unstressed syllables.

Cosijn's list is without specific references. The number of occurrences is given, but yields, no result:—

-ecean, -ecneccan, -drencum, -dumecard, êcea êccan êccan, êcin, êcium frycecea, -can, gefylcea. n, hnecean, geil(é)cean, -écead, gemetlâêcead, lâêcas, gemaeccean, gemaeccanne, a-, gerecceam, neccead, -êcean, to -écceanne, -eccead, -êcfela: -gerepraêccea, -can, -tostencean, -stencas, -astrecceard, gesuencean, to -suencanne, gesuincuin, -tâccan, -hlencea, -hlencuin, -wreccean, -wraccea, -can, -botwrencas, -botworoldwrencium, -wyrcean, to -wyrceanne, -wyrcead, -hlencean, to -hleceanne, -hlencard -hyncean, -ead, -olecciung, on Mercium, Lidwiccium, Hwiccium.

-hycgean, -hecgead, -hecgean, -ecgean etc., -gehecgean, -forhyggean, -gehyggean,

sferhtegegeard, leeggean, eeggean, getyg-
egean, legean, getegean, tregean, tyggean,
tehtegean, dryggean, uffegean, fylgean,
siwenig(g)ean, tyggeanburg, men(i)geo, men-
gio, tleorsalegeas, enig(g)ean, wile, tegean,
getiggiean, andfengeost, getrengean, ge-
trengean, londlegengea, glengea, genen-
geard, stengeas, strengeas etc.

A glance at these examples will show that
this t.i is unmistakably a development of orig-
inal j. The theory that would explain it simply
as an indication of palatal quality of the con-
sonant (caused by preceding palatal vowel or
what not) certainly does not here find its
justification. In no case (except in) is the
i, e found except where there was original j.
Let us test this position by a rapid survey of the
forms listed by Cosijn under these various gram-
matical rubrics:—

When the e comes in from the nom.

o-stems :- fiscas 0226.6, in(n)gerdncas 155.21, etc., weorcum 417.17, brocen 35.12 etc. loca 0250.21 etc; hringas 169.21; heargas 157. 5.7 (hearga 153.22 in declens.?) dagas 247.14 dæges 39.5 · ierminga s 092.29: hringum 1241 611. hringas 0256.32, tintregs 054.21.

The jo-stems on the contrary yield laec- eas 24.20 etc. (4 cases beside læcas 25.20 etc. 4 cases).

a-stems :- mearca 0114.34, sprecan 277.15; and note various forms in ung - asung, cwacung etc., longung, genetgung (hergung with i from hergian) - none of which take e.i before case ending.

But the jā-stems have (world)wlenc(e)um 83.16 etc., cæg(e)a 179.9; bis(e)gum is uthat the e. Note also the

i-stems :- dryncas 016.12, etc. c(e)as 65.20 etc. lotwrenc(e)as 203.5, 17.16, drenc(e) um 269.24, lotwrenc(e)um 203.19, 20. wor[illegible]

wrencium 203.24, gesewinca 239.8, ge-
sewincum 35.7 etc. (7 cases); cwicum, 129.1. etc. (3)
hyggeas 54.6, hleorsiegeas 261.6, segum 1116.3
steng(e)as 169.22 etc., strong(e)as 115.6, gyn-
g(e)a, 85.1.4.

II declension:— drinca 6232.16, saca.
163.4, sc(e)onca 123.14, spearca 87.6, buc-
can 271.4, scinlaccan 03.19, genacan 331.2
wiecan Chron. 878, tinecan 6234.23.31, wocum.
Chron. 887.

anga 309.15, elnboga 143.17, broga 109.6
slaga 275.7, heretoga 127.7. witga 31'. etc.
magan 319.7, plegan 1118.83, etc., flegan
439.24, thegan 461.19, etc.

Compare with these frysecea (fricgan, pr.
present), wraeccea 078.33, landbegeng(e)a 273.2
cwyngeam 205.12

Englum 69.17 takes its e from the num. like cynicg,
cf. segum 65,4.

Adjectives -ig, -lic in -isc do not show the e. i.

Of the -jo stems :- ecc(i) um 149.22 etc. (wælengum 41.6, (wilg) gl. um 01c2.6) ; ecsan 87.5 etc.; fedal (ides) stræc- (e)an 175.21 etc ;

In the strong verbs, innumerable examples without an exception are afforded of c and g followed by a, o, without the e. i. Contrasted with these appears the jo present gelicgeð - licgþ ad 111.2, 1793, etc. beside liecgað 233.24.

Examples of the weak verbs need scarcely be adduced here. They show the i-i almost invariably - drencan, screncan are notable as affording exceptions.

Magan. magon. show no i, e.

This testimony is certainly plain. In these texts in every case the e. i is historically warranted as the remnant of original j.

Medial Palatalisation.

Palatalisation of c.g.h. in medial position may theoretically be supposed to have anticipated initial palatalisation by a considerable period of time. For the first part of a word tends naturally to change less rapidly than the medial or final portion. Furthermore where an initial consonant could only be affected by a palatal vowel following, medial consonants came under the influence of the j, and other dominant consonantal sounds.

The history of the prehistoric medial changes is and will always be full of difficulty. The history of the development of medial palatals like Middle English will not be so much difficult as it will be long, owing to the fact that almost every word, while conforming to general laws, has an individual development, through analogy or compromise between dialectic forms or what not.

Before touching upon the question of the character and extent of the evidence regarding medial palatalisation, a few notes are in place concerning the elementary facts of the subject.

In speaking of the use of g as a symbol for j, Sievers says that as a final, it is rare and only met with after a long vowel. This use of g is to be brought into relation with the stable g found after long palatal vowels. This g for j (I - to modify Sievers's statement - is met with after a long final vowel.

Representing pure voice, there were of course in the oblique cases, hiatus conditions. It was natural in course of time that before the case-endings with guttural vowel, instead of the traditional j should come into use. Thus we find hirium and hwerim in the Charters - and the interesting freak form iwoa for geoc. Nowhere is the

fact clearly stated that this w is due to hiatus — the process is described as a sort of combination of vocalisation and rounding. The ~~real~~ process which really went on was full vocalisation, and then interchange of hiatus i with hiatus w, giving often double forms.

The statement in Sievers regarding the palatal character of the combinations hh. ht. x. — simply that the h became palatal — sums all that is known. But it would seem a correct inference not to ascribe the palatalisation to the t alone, also as shewn by past analogy of guttural mutes; but to the fact that the h stands between a palatal vowel and a consonant which is at least not a protection. In accordance with this theory, the h remained guttural after gutturals, and the loss of it in Middle English

Sievers's note on dialectic difference will be shewn to be mistaken later.

in such position would be due to the levelling act of the speech-organs — i.e. it would have off a guttural breath. The difference seems to be still apparent in the difference between bought, sought, and might, light etc.

Sievers's statement with regard to the prevention of u-o umlaut by c and g simply gives the fact. The explanation suggested by Dr James W. Bright in his lectures on English Grammar in the winter of 1893-4 is here stated and applied. It proceeds on a theory of a partition of quality in the consonant, entirely obviating the difficulty of assuming a palatal affection that left no trace of in the Middle English development.

Medial c and g, initial or medial is unchanged syllables have been already discussed, and the not-infrequent glide, e.i explained as a remnant of anglian j. Since then the thought has suggested itself that

if the glide only, hetakened palatal quality we should expect to find it after adjectives in -isc, but it is not there found.

Epenthetic c in such cases as sclaecnes can only be explained on the theory of the frequency of the sc combination initial.

C is in general fairly stable. Its tendency to pass into h, q only appears in unstressed particles or syllables and represents as the case may be palatal or guttural spirancy.

Medial ch very probably represents an affricative — werc-hes.

The interchange of g and h. becomes in the special examples perfectly clear. when it is remembered that there was clear recognition of the g as symbol of pure voice. of h as pure breath, and that they ranged from these values up to the value of full spirancy.

A number of examples are here collected of the appearance of c for g in the combination ng. In the course of the preliminary study of c and g before a, the difficult question of the undeveloped use of the voiced stop in Middle English kept presenting itself, and in working through the dictionaries and explanation offered itself — namely that the g before liquids was more than probably a voiced stop in A.S., and that in Middle English with general loss of distinction, what ever g's remained unvocalized were levelled out to the stop. An enumeration of the gs showed that a large proportion — more than half — were found before consonants. It was encouraging later to find that Cosijn makes the suggestion that g was possibly a stop before liquids. The matter will be treated in connection with Middle English.

The evidence examined in the selected texts is of the following character :—

Palatal umlaut is naturally the phenomenon of greatest interest and importance. The alleged umlaut of the breaking before h. ht is first examined and it is shown by evidence drawn from the various dialect and of various character that in non-W.S. possibly excluding sporadic cases in Kentish. There was no breaking of a before h, h+cons., but instead a lengthening as before l. This lengthening holds for a and for e.

Palatal umlaut by partition of the diphthongs derived from i-o umlaut, and prevention of the umlaut is then discussed.

Palatal umlaut of the breakings is then considered through a period following the W.S.

Following this, palatal umlaut of the long vowels is considered

The possibility of special heightenings of vowels due to following palatals is then inquired into, followed by a discussion of the evidence which the monuments present in this regard.

A survey of general conditions in the region — breaking, umlaut, and so forth — in order to emphasise the fact of the general tendency of the Northern dialects to palatal and guttural and of the Southern to palatal affection, of the North to monophthongisation, of the South to diphthongisation.

Incidentally a number of matters are considered, — the character of the English ê for æ, but as a shortening combination, ie a dialectic form of umlaut, the etymology of beaht, of ealond, of beactrogas, typical diphthongs in W.S., ê = æ in W.S., breaking through guttural cons. + guttural vowel, the distribution and chronology of u.o, umlaut, and so forth

Northumbrian: Ritual, and Lindisfarne Gloss.

Palatal Umlaut:—

The consideration of palatal umlaut brings us at once to the consideration of the question whether we are justified in assuming the breaking of a before l, h + cons. as having been a general Anglo-Saxon phenomenon. Lindelöf (§ 11) accepts the usual view that this breaking "sicher ursprünglich germanisch-englisch gewesen ist" and explains the æ of the Ritual as due to later palatal quality of the h.

In questioning this, the fact that there are six words which show no breaking before r + cons. to eleven which do show it, is certainly suggestive,— and also the uniform retention of a before l. What happened in these cases? Would Lindelöf posit a reborrowing?

Examples are (§ 9.1): — nedbarf 90.18, arm (bracchium) 1.7 31.9; arm (egenus) 124.20; 175.17; farra (taurii) 107.10; staincarr 19.11; -ward 21.3; fa nigu (proximus) is ch — e. In the Gloss (§ 11) 3 forms with a, 10 with æ: the divided cases (included) are: — warð (4a, 1æa) warþ (1a, 1æa, 10æa) warde (2a, 12æa).

to primitive conditions? By no means. The a is the original a — at most there is a difference in length. For the cases without breaking before r, special explanations might of course be proposed. - position under secondary stress, initial position of vowel, retention of foreign quality in a loan-word, labial influence — but the fact remains that here unlike W.S. there is, or has been for some cause or other, sufficient conservative energy exerted to effect the retention of the original vowel — in one third of the forms before r + cons., in all the forms before l + cons!

Compare now the cases of l + cons. Here we find æ throughout.

Except gesealla 188.3, where influence of a is to be considered. Lea, Glossa. § 18; - gesaeh, gesaeh, unwahton, maehl, maehle, maehte etc., maehlig, naht, wahtung, waxes, unbehtnesse, e to the present (Sievers. 467a Note 3). Embehtmonn IX.35 etc. (cf. embiht XIV.5) is exceptional, cf. the verbal form ge-embehta X.45. Note particularly gelahte VII.33, etc. (5) in the light of the accepted theory.

(mæht, mæhti, æhta, gisæht, læht, wæx, gisæh) The æ is explained as due to a palatal umlaut, a checking of ea (= æa). So far there is no difficulty but note further the fact pointed out, but not explained by himself that "i umlaut besides its still well known main: mæht, mæhtig, mæht. u.s.w." If æ as postulated the æa before h was like that before r, why do we not have ē as the umlaut, as is the case before r + cons.? The answer suggests itself that palatalisation of the h through the umlaut. i, and consequent checking of the diphthong took place before the umlaut affected the vowel directly. Granting this and supposing the diphthong was monophthongized to æ, the question must still be asked why do we have æ in forms that should have the umlaut? Let us suppose lengthening accompanied the checking in which case the umlaut would be properly ǣ. This involves too much the hypothesis of a change in quality and quantity due to the h, before the [illegible]

given to itself the necessary quality by and affected the vowel, is untenable. In brief, *maakte should have given meht, just as *aarmiken gave ermdenn 41.5 *Maakte, ~~would~~ > *maakte gives meht, and we have maht. *Maakte > mâhte > mâht with a change in length not in quality is impossible.

Assume now the absence of breaking and difficulties disappear. H at once becomes comparable with l and justifies the comparison. Here in the cases with l, just as in the cases with h the umlauted vowel is æ.

But how then is the æ of the forms without umlaut to be explained?

Two explanations offer themselves. The first of these supposes an original a sound sufficiently palatal in quality to be broken before the strong guttural r, but not before h or l where it persists as a; the six cases before r without breaking will be remembered. L through its

labial quality. preserves the a, with æ as the umlaut. H similarly preserves a with æ as the umlaut, but after the period of umlaut, the a of the forms without umlaut is heightened by, or its heightening permitted by the later palatalization of the h. supposedly one of the earlier effect of that sweep of palatalization in which c and g shared — whose influence exhibits itself so markedly in many ways and the inception of whose activity at no great length before the historic period is indicated to some extent by its relations to the umlaut. In this way the a becomes æ — and here it may be recalled that even before r. we find three cases of æ, ned hearf 37.18, ondræerdniss' 122. 13, wærla 39.13.

This explanation however is felt to be unsatisfactory in that it demands too great a difference in ~~guttural~~ quality between æ and this æ in the clearly labial

that is in other words that is, it supposes the diphthong

from an a-sound – as the umlaut is ae – while
r could break and h could not). Moreover it
does not take into account another matter –
namely that the a before l, ld, ng, nd, nk, lg.

This leads us to ask what was the state of the case
with regard to length before h + cons. Hempl (Mod.
Lang. Notes VII. 197) adduces examples in support
of a shortening before this combination. He would
seem as if he was disposed to generalise too hastily
"Germ. ā, W.G. a, shortens" he says "in O.E. before h +
cons. (Sievers § 125, Kluge, P.'s Grundr. 1. p. 868) and the
short vowel is later broken to ea (Sievers § 82). I can-
find no reference to such shortening under these
headings. They refer simply to the lack of accent on
the vowels in Dohte, brohte, sohte, and to the fact
that in Orm the vowel seems to be short in these
words. Sievers makes no positive statement in regard
to them, and nowhere gives an example of a breaking
of original ā. Certainly in regard to Dohte etc. it

would be impossible to posit primitive shortening.

Apart part from this reference to breaking of ā of which no examples are given and none forthcoming in the references, Temple adduces smealic (OIdly. smalic), nēalaccan, nealice etc. weofod. betweonum, and of course leoht. This is certainly not abundant evidence for assuming what would be universal shortening before ht: It is at once to be pointed out that there is no example which is absolutely satisfactory except leoht. The question of the possibility of weakened stress in compounds at once suggests itself. The fact that betweonan appears beside betwinan and betweonum would certainly justify the supposition that we have here simply i with a following glide (Cf. Cowgill §70) which appears in the type from which the influence of the to and the ne ~~Cf. Cowgill §70~~ ~~which appears in the type from which the influence of the to and the ne~~

Theoretically we have no grounds for assuming the h + cons to be a shortening combination. The consonant is of such a character that the question of relative length will be one of interchange between vowel and consonant. So far as quality enters into the matter, it would certainly seem as if strong guttural quality of the h would favour length in the vowel. The interchange however is so readily made that lessened stress through a strong secondary accent like that on lic might easily cut to a long vowel its length. And the general question of length or shortness before the combination might well be probably be a matter of dialectal distribution. Through forms, it is to be remembered are confined to Southern literature.

The Northumbrian would seem to have retained a primitive lengthening due to the h. Upon the possibility of this combination: Hung

a lengthening combination, we have not yet touched: it is however a possibility, just as it is a possibility that it might be a shortening combination. Note that in Old Norse (Noreen § 111) ht shares with lh, hr the power to lengthen the preceding vowel. This appl, as we have seen, is confined in Sievers to cases of breaking of ê, shortened to æ, which are not there given. We omitted to take note of the fact that Sievers calls attention to lack of breaking in lahta, or in the foreign traktian, or why there should not have been shortening in rahta, tahte and consequent breaking.

Fortunately we are not without evidence of a positive character with regard to the nature of this combination in the Gothic as a lengthening factor. The question as to whether h has broke e must be left open, so far as the evidence is concerned for in any case the reason

is e, the æ being reduced to e by palatal umlaut. But there are beside the ruling cases with e, a number of cases with æ: — cnæht 1.14, 53.4, 101.17 and once cnahtas 102.4 over against three cases with e, also gefæht 60, 10, 70.11, unafæhtendlic 42.9 over against 18 cases with e: similarly in the Glos we have gesæh (vide) XV.4, cnæhta VII, 28, IX, 24, 36, 37. Now these forms found in both texts are at first sight extremely difficult of explanation. Simple occurrence of æ for e is in this text extremely rare. "Die Belege" says Lindelöf (§4) sind äusserst spärlich und z. Teil nicht ganz deutlich." There are in fact four cases (excluding bæd a bed dæg (Epiphany) as more than dubious). Are we to believe then that the æ which occurs four times, elsewhere in the entire text occurs here six times. Similarly in the Glos æ for e occurs in nine words throughout

the text, several of these moreover of admitting of explanation (dæwscende beside gedæwsca 7, weg beside weeg, wæs affected by, wæron, etc.). The numerous cases then of æ for e before h. h + t, x are not then simply cases of short æ for short e. Nor are they because of the graph of æ's from a before h. h + t x: for there is no interchange of e for æ in that group. Their simply explanation is the fact that long ê does interchange with long ê — (x x x x) more 55. 8. 77 18, f'læton 21. 20, mægd 190. 12, giræde 71. 6, girade 108. 3, giræded 86. 12, f'ræden 27. 14, ewæ (114 cases); (gen. ê) æce 27. 19 etc (4); æ (from êa) êc 1. 6 etc. (137), dæh 48. 9 etc; ræcelc 70. 13; furthermore we have in the form cnæhtas 102. 4 a distinct suggestion of the special North. diphthong of long ê from êa. h. 11. 'then, ... find æt II. 16. wæron 1. 13 etc., eghwæs XVI. 20 sæ 1. 2, æce IX. 45, sæ X. 24, æc III. 28 (17) etc.

foreflach XIV. 52; lach XIV. 60, atach XIV. 47
dach IX. 42, dach VIII. 36, etc. (3). It may be
also noted that beside gefraegn (3 cases to in.
1 gefregen) appears gefrugnad, Rit. 36. 5. gefraegn
Flor. VIII. 5 (3), justifying assuming the ai of the form
cnaihtas as lng.

This reasoning would certainly seem to
warrant the assumption of length in the case
of æ before h + cons., and justifies the simi-
lar assumption in regard to æ in the following
explanation of the development of a in a
similar position.

That explanation is as follows. Starting
as usually, posited from the æ sound, there
was a breaking before r but not before h
or before l. In place of the breaking, perhaps
assisting to prevent it, there was lengthening
before the h and l combinations. Simple
æ persisted before terminal h, and h + cons. in

case.
possessing of course immunity from i-umlaut
The l however exhibited its characteristic
quality. It substituted for the low front vid.
the low-back narrow round, and thus evidenced
itself in the use of a as in Mod. Eng. palter.
alderman.

In conclusion it may be remarked that just
as the i-umlaut of ea before r afforded proof that
the æ before h does not represent *æa, so also
the palatal checking of ea before rc, rg. This
ea checks back to æa as contrasted with the æ
before h, which is on the theory of a breaking before
h, precisely similar in origin.

This remark concerning the l is inserted simply for clear-
ness. It is of course a necessary assumption no
matter what theory be held regarding the breaking

The examples of e before h, h + cons., are as follows:-

h: feh. 190.3, bisch. 8. 2, 10.18, etc; (bisih 22. 14., bisigh 15. 12)

ht: cneht, 100. 10 (3); breht, 20.15 etc; leht 10. 19 etc; reht 57.4 etc.; fehto 6.4 etc; frehtum (auspiciis) 97.7 (not wholly clear);

cneht 1.14 (3) cneihtas 102. 14, lehtes 38 15. gifeht 60.10, 70. 11; unfehtendlic 92. 9.

x: rex, 116.19

The i-umlaut is i:- girihta 174. 18 etc., gelihta 178. 2, etc., gilixia 94. 8, but note gilehta 37. 15, 173. 21; gibrehta 160. 20

Lea. §19: feh, breht, gefehto, leht-, reht, rex. (i-umlaut lixendo IX. 3. inlihtest, gesweh (subj.) XV. 4 - possibly due to preterit and gesih I. 44 etc. follow the umlaut form or copy [illegible].

The question of the possibility of a lack of breaking here has already been touched upon by explication. In any case were the e short, we should here expect variation between e and eo just as a x ea varies before l in W.S. Upon the theory that the e is long, we are not justified in assuming any breaking whatsoever

It may be asked whether the assumption of length does not make a difficulty with regard to the forms with i-umlaut, the umlauted vowel appearing as i. It need only be pointed out that there are rather to be considered special heightenings like that of lihtes 30.15, and that without the assumption of length there would be difficulty in explaining the three cases with e—gilehta 37.15, 173.21, gibrehta 100.20. In brief the cases with umlaut condition, suppose the assumption that the e was long

Preservation of i.u. umlaut —

The i.u. umlaut is lacking before c and g. Lindelöf is in doubt whether to regard them as original, or as due to palatal umlaut

If original, c and g had shifted towards palatal quality to a considerable degree by the time the umlaut became operative. The presumption is against this considering the extent of its influence in Northumbrian quite comparable with that in Mercian, where intervening c and g offer no bar to its operation. The umlaut there from probably took effect at first in spite of c and g, and the recovery of primitive conditions is to be explained as due to a dropping of the glide between the slight palatal e and the guttural-palatal consonant following (for explanation is full see below h.)

Gloss. Lea § 16. 1. 2c

Palatal umlaut of breaking.

*Ear, eor + palatal is reduced by palatal umlaut to ę:-

ea > ę:- gemercade 57.15 (u). ærce (1144.8)

eo > ę:- berhtnisse 2.13.16; herh 25.33 etc; hærh 42.11

Lindelöf admits nerxna 124.2 here. The propriety of doing this is doubtful as neirxna 134.4 also occurs, indicating that the vowel was ēa. Milc 25.14, also here listed, vowel seem to be rather a case of checked u-o umlaut.

The i-umlaut is i, brigende 99.5, gebriga 99.10 116.3, wyrca 6.17, 16.11 etc.

The case with e giberhta 3.2, 102.22 does not belong here, but under palatal h deflexion of o before h. cf. gibreht̄a above

1

Less. Glos. ut supra; - merca, berga, (eo > ę) hęrcas, mercę. (where (with i umlaut) gebirgad gębirgdon, byrcę

Palatal umlaut of ēa, ēo[1]

(ēac > ēc) bēcon 18.19 etc.; becnendo 103.4, ēce 33.15, tc.; gibrece 88.14, onlece 46.20

ᵹēaᵹ > ēᵹ, eyebeᵹ 1.8, etc. eᵹo (oculi) 11.4 etc.; ᵹefleᵹ 147.8.

ēah > ēh; deh 191.9 etc; leh, 1.8 etc., neh. 10.14

ēoᵹ > ēᵹ; giflega, 118.15 etc..

eox > ex: gerexon, 81.12.

The spelling æ occurs as listed above. Lindelöf wrongly lists raæcelc 70.13. Herra, Leela, last classed by Lindelöf as umlaut forms will be referred to later. For the regular umlaut of ēa before palatals, we must look to a special North. development, ei:- heista 68.13, etc deiglum 168.7 ceiga 5.7, etc. cein 12.84, eleista 123.17. Here ᵹeleᵹ (formicator)[107.1] is anomalous. This relation ē - ei is parallel to that of ea - i. and is characteristic of Northern

[1] Gloss. Lea. §61: (a) beam. ᵹebrec ec (1) [illegible] (4) beᵹ ego, leh. neh. (cc) fleᵹende, leᵹerum.
Cf Lea. §63 ceiga fifleᵹ. heista, eleiste beacnum,

General Conditions.

It is important that a rapid survey ~~oversight~~ should be made of the vowel conditions generally to gather what light may be afforded with regard to qualitative tendency

Special retention of guttural quality (aside from ah, racenteg, which are paralleled in W.S) perhaps appears in racene 85.1 (but cf. 63.15 wacana) accras 118.12, acrum 145.7, and tal 111.4 (influence of u-form?). The W.S. has wælcene; possibly there is here retention of labial quality. The two forms of acer alternate consistently — cf. W.S. æcer (here once æcer 147.12). In the Gloss we find ah T. 45 etc; ahne ii. 19 etc; æca vi. 11 (if we can agree with Lea that this is a close syllable). tal, Pref. i. 12: fasne vi. 56 (perhaps metathesis)

A is heightened to e in a few cases. Under this rubric we must throw out feder 180.11 (norm) itself exceptional beside feader 16.8 as due to the datives

form (feder occurs as nom. + acc. in the Ps. 26. 10 etc. 12 times, Zeuner § 3.1.6). Fetelocc 97.8 is wrongly classed here by Lindelöf – the e is long and regular for WS. æ. In heffera 21.5, the vowel is historically short. caper – but possibly we have here a lengthening like that in ofer, sloafe. At all events with the exception of this single example, e appears for æ only before medial g: -feger, 41. etc. (3 cases) fegerne, ' 3. 11. 12, gigegnad 45.11: hehstald 67.2 etc.

This e would seem to indicate vocalisation of the g ? as must have early begun to weaken before consonants. cf. the use of it in the process of vocalisation in hehstald 67.2 (cf. WS. hagostealdh, hagedeald, haegsteald)

That the vocalic function of the g was recognised

Lea. § 3.3 gives a number of forms with e for æ i-fragm. Magden loses its g in maden v. 39 etc (4) without change of vowel.

appears in the insertion in Sweet examples such as the following: - wrohtfulle 116.7, bisegh 15.12; hezh 193.5, wogsum 27.7, wighed (ref. §44.3 not given), gi-rəəcg 123.20. These cases are cited by Lindelöf under various headings and no explanation given. Undoubtedly the g indicates vowel length and should have been referred to by Lindelöf in his chapter upon such indications. It is strange that he did not notice at least the case of wig-hed Sweet speaks (§ 376) of ig-i, and Lindelöf himself refers to Sweet's mention of it (p. 68). Here we have an interesting extension of the use of g. We have even ventured to include girəəcg 123.20 occurring beside gi-rəəc. The only case to which our explanation of this inserted g does not palæographically apply is wrigh. Was the e of MS. Cowic Omg° [illegible] a scribal error, it may be due to the predominant ig suffix. This use of g does not appear in the Glossa: it is however employed in ewyndria xiv.g. wiendreo Prof. 1.13 wendreia xiv.61. beside weindrige.

To return to general conditions – æ does not occur where one would expect a, nor ie for e.

The Umlauts.

A few striking features may detain our attention for a moment. The first of them is the frequent occurrence of æ as the umlaut of a – gehæfted, ræst, sæcgende, gesægde etc.: æfþenden, efþenden, mælte (13.15) beside met (105.6). Lindelöf hesitates concerning wid æccende 34.10, wæccendo 38.13, gisægde 124.12. Unless there are strong forms with a heightened to æ, æ is, certainly here, to be regarded as the umlaut of a. Spæcia 40.16, gespæredе 227 are dubious Lea. § 23; fæst, ræst (7) rest (3), gesælte (according to Sievers without umlaut, cf. § 110.2 but why not like mælte above?); Also æcced-, xv. 23.36, læccanne xiv. 48, ægo, sægde v. 41 etc., wæcca, wæccas xiii, 37, xiv. 33, 34 37. 38, (gewæccas. xiii. 35) etc., gewægde. iv. 25

forms as sparrain is of the second conjugation of sparria (possibly so by analogy to verria, herna, etc, says Lindelöf, we would have to be looked upon as the umlaut of a.

The a before l as we have seen umlauts to æ. In the case of the breaking before r we have e. This is undoubtedly the umlaut of ea, else breaking would be later than umlaut. It is in perfect analogy to the palatal umlauts of ea before r+c.g. and the palatal umlauts of êa, êo. The theory that would explain then e as a reduction of ie is most improbable; it simply illustrates the danger of taking W.S. as a criterion for other dialects. The natural process of a palatal affection like this of i-umlaut in the case of a diphthong with an initial closed element is simply to cause the dropping of the glide. If then [illegible] i, or if in preservation of a diphthongal quality

the second element of the diphthong is preserved as e. That is another matter.

O > oe (oefrista 96.3, 175.2, oele 65.17, 198.16) ; once e (exen 117.14)

Our results so far are as follows. We have for single texts an unusually large number of unlaunted forms in o; the accumulation to e, not to the markedly heightened form it assumes in W.S., and the umlaut of o gives evidence of retaining its labial quality, as over against W.S. e.

Turning to the long vowels, our attention is arrested by the ê for W.S. éa. This ê may be regarded as still awaiting explanation. There is no doubt that it cannot be regarded as in the same plane with Goth. ê. Lindelöf (§17.1) explains it as a narrowing. It may suffice us.

Lea, Umlt Elem § 25 — Luick, Prof. 3, XVII, on ie, ue XV.1, eo XV.1 [illegible]

at present to dismiss the possibility of it's being a palatal heightening.

A comparison with W.S. results as follows:— For the i-umlaut of â (=ai) W.S. has æ, — Nhrth. has æ, and beside æ, ê in clene (claene), eghwer, eghwerna, eghwelc beside æghwelcum. gineolecdest, dem. dæghrenlice.
For Goth. e, W.S. has æ, Nhrth. has ē but also æ in rære etc. f' læden' etc., mægd, a number of forms of næden, and ernæ;
For umlaut of æ (from Goth. e.) W.S. has æ, Nhrth has è, but æ in gæst 47.19, gæst 55.5, ungæ 18.20 ("u.s.w" says Luidelöf) To these læa. 46.4; eghwelc. eghwær etc., gemælcedæ, ecn. el. ecnisse.

[2] il. 43.3. æt, wæron. eg hwær, swæ,
il. 43.1 gæ. gæ (8)
il. 61.1.c; fyreflæsh, hæt, ælæt, flæh. flæt, læ. læh. læh.

are to be added occurrences of æ as æc (bench
ec) dash bench dash, ræcalc.

One hesitates considering the reverence with
which this æ is to be treated to regard it as
contrasted with W.S. æ, as matter simply of
orthographic accident. But such seem to be
the case. In the first place its the constant relation
of the sound indicated
is ê. ê just as that of W.S. æ is æ — æ. In
the second place it is closely comparable with
the æ from ai, as the constant interchange, exhibited
above makes clear, — just as in W.S. close simi-
larity is indicated by use of one symbol. But
why then are the back of the æ's separated for the
back of the é's? The answer is that the scribe
naturally used the æ symbol for the sound of
long a, just as he used it for the sound of short
a. But even the case of the æ sound from Germ. e, when
his choice lay between the symbols æ and e, unlike
the W.S. he chose the e, possibly because of the frequent

occurrence of the ēo from palatal umlaut, to which there would must have attributed in character — hate above as for e from eo. ê. it is also 151. 1) that the "long éó sound — the Tenth Gloss is uniformly represented by e while the former is derived from ai". Certainly it would not seem as if umlaut would be an justified in assuming that this éo stands for a sound different from that symbolized in W.S. by éo.

To pass on: the i-umlaut of ô is éo like that of short o., i.e. the labial quality has not yielded to the palatal, unless the éo be orthographic tradition.

The umlaut of êa is ê just as that of ea is e, as over against the W.S. ie. Lindelöf notes one possible umlaut from with i-gringungo 107. 20 — in case the word is connected with OHG. gorrna (= ephulae)

These points with regard to the general sound Lea: North. Glos: 50 Only two instances of ê occur.

condition in North Clearly indicate the general tendency towards concentration of Cretaceous population, as contrasted with the tendency towards palatalization in the South.

The Consonants.

Thus far we have been concerned with the vowels We turn now to the consonants in question, themselves. There are but few points to be noted.

c:- It occurs for c regularly in the unstressed syllables: ath 6.4 etc., with 13.8, with 107.2. (§42). So also the Gloss (§99.1) ath. meh (mec), deh (dec). with. with, with.

g final occurs for c in wrig, 7.6. 9.9. Gloss has wrig 1.24, wrig xi.9, hunlig xiii. 1. (beside hulic v. 16) arlig, Pref. 5.16 (beside arlice xvi. 2) wlonga (dicitum) Pref. 4 xxxii, beside wlonca x.25, xii. 41.

It is impossible to say with decision that substitution of h and g indicates anything. If it indicates anything it would be that the stop had been replaced by a spirant - i.e. was one step towards disappearance. But as seen above forms with c occur beside those with h, and in the Gloss with ch, a

spelling which usually indicates the spirant of
here, however, channanesca III. 8, carchern vi. 17; michil
v. 11, mychelo, iv. 37. 39

G: G, unlike as in N. S, does not become in unslant.
The precisely quality of the final g it is im-
possible to determine. The g disappears as
pointed out above in maden, gen. V. 39 (4) beside
maegden V. 41 (7), and ig appears as i in
scundric Pref. 1, 13. cundiria XIV. 66, beside
cuindrige IX. 2 (4)
A notable point is the use of c for g, in its bear-
ing upon the question whether the g is to be regard-
ed as a stop in that position. The cases are as
follows:- Ritual halgunc 118 Rutr., halguncge 117. Rutr. 1. 2.
Glass:- cnfence VI. 41 (cnfenge XVI. 19) glencas XIII. 2
gewyncerde (cwriit) XI. 12 (w for hy beside hyn
gerde II. 25); stencum (legnus) XIV, 43 (beside
stengum XIV. 118) ofermercunc Pref. 4. XXXIII;
lesinc, X. 45, Kronne (crucem) VIII, 34: brencgas

ix, 19; land-bryncgum. xii. 1, rowincg. vi. 48; lengc v, 35; wæpnegc v. 29, ælteowunnoc (preoflen[u](e) V. 25 (with ae probably written for gc). Note also wlenga Prof. 4. xxxii for wlonca x. 25, x. 1. 41

H:- Regarding h, there is nothing to be noted except that it drops in se(i) eta 123. 17, 183. 10, Lehteta 34. 26 etc. Neosta 193. 1. and the second and third singular of contract verbs - except gisihde 58. 8. 116 2., gesihde 162. 7. Herra, heosta (hest) belongs here. A similar assimilation to that of herra appears in heannisse 1. 10 beside heahnisse 83. 2. Perhaps the single case, deah 66. 13 is to be adduced here. In both cases ea is preserved, presumably because of the loss of h before the time of palatal umlaut

Precisely similar examples occur in the Ritual To these are to be added the exceptional forms: locter (fluium) Prof. 3. xxi; leoht (splendorem) xiii 24; maeghte (uirtute) ix. 1. The use of c for h is an archaism (cf. Caedmon's Hymn maecti 2) and it

ch of lecht is to be regarded probably as scribal error due to this. This however is not the case with mæghte when the introduction of the g with [illegible] spe. rancy, and also the similarity of the sounds indicated by 3 and h.

Curious cases of gemination occur apparently without reason: - unrasæcgendlic, Rit. 35.8, unasæccendlic 108.13. gecnycgum 94.2. of Dryges 122.7.; so in the Glos in ham the unwarranted geminations on bæcg xiii.16 (beside on bæce viii.33, and gebræcge (fregit) vi.41), while with others fall under a numerous group of consonants geminated after short vowels, while an simple in W.S. (103.II.1). There are also a number of cases of simple consonants substituted for geminated. There is in fact a general confusion and irregularity, obtaining in all the groups and not only in the guttural-palatal group -

It would seem as if under c. Lindelöff should have referred to plæcum 36.3, 65.18, bæcere 56.7 etc(15)

fracchere 56.5, to which he refers in his treatment of ce (§3.1) The c. of placcum is surely exceptional in value, and that of bracere, if as would seem it is connected with baptista (for placcum, cf. Pogatscher p. 9. and § 205; braccare he does not touch upon). In both cases assibilation must be assumed, in the light of which assumption the spelling ch in bachere is of particular interest. One would, a priori, suppose it to be a Latin spelling and such it is presumably in Latin proper names — but here, and possibly even in carcern (carchern and subm) it may represent an attempt to give express graphic representation of the c, verging on ś. (cf. Sievers §204 Note 1.)

Lindelöf makes no reference to braccilla 166. 40de. Miss Lea similarly notes only ce (§3.1) placcum VI. 57

Lindelöf cites beside placcum, the curious word plagi- word (plateis) 36.3. So given one supposes connection with the Latin word, but the fact is the Latin is glossed by both — "in plagi- word and in placcum". The sense presumably = plagetow.

and Faecilla (Lucerna) IV. 21 ("possibly [a loan-word] if it is a by-form of faecale"). Of the c in Faecilla, there can be but little question; it is also the c of the Faecale group after which it is patterned. (Pogatscher § 260)

To what extent c, g, h final had disappeared, we have no decisive evidence. The retention of g in amulant (taken in connection with its use as an indicator of length) would seem to indicate that it had there almost or entirely disappeared. The use of h for c in similar position in unstressed syllables would seem to indicate a weakening of the c. Concerning h final we can of course left entirely in the dark., as well as concerning the exact state reached by both g and c medially in their way towards vocalisation.

Finally as regards palatalisation of c, g, or h - the matter has in great measure been discussed

And g for c in the Glen (Lea § 99.2), cf. above.

by implication in the treatment of palatal umlaut. Whatever the decision may be concerning the length of the vowel before ht, there is satisfactory evidence of the palatal quality of the h before t in the heightening of the vowel in liht, and (whether breaking be accepted or not) in the presence of umlaut forms with i beside others in e.

Regarding c and g, inferences can be drawn only from those cases in which we may be sure that at some time they were preceded by an a or o, which has become e. Committing ourselves on a priori consideration, and on the testimony of Corpus + PS. to the belief that e,i resulted through a-o umlaut before c and g as before other consonants, we must ascribe to these consonants a later palatalisation to explain the change of the o, ie to e, i. The retention however of gutteral quality in Middle English forbids our accepting the idea of a thorough going palatalisation

ation — because for example gwin brake —
the following explanation accordingly offers
itself. These sounds, being by nature extremely
sensitive to affections in a palatal direction and
readily adapting themselves to their surround-
ings, have in these words as it were by partial
accommodated themselves to the character of
the vowels which precede and follow; that
is, the skewed element of the diphthong effects
a union with the g or c to the exclusion of
the guttural glide between, while on the other
hand by a kind of syncopation, the g or c remain
guttural before the guttural vowel of the end-
ing. That is *spreowan > sprec. can. Sk similar
phenomenon appears in our pronunciation of
"don't you" and similar phrases. We may pro-
nounce the "don't" clearly, but even with the greatest
care it is difficult to avoid a palatal sound before the

Suggested by Dr. James W. Bright in his lectures during the winter
of 1893 4.

i-glide of the ae.

If now the hypothesis be true, c and g should always have the power to check an ea or eo to g. The only ea and eo occurring before c and g would be the long êa and êo. These are properly enough reduced to e.

Without this explanation it would have been difficult to have explained palatal quality of the c and g in many places where it has produced monophthongisation — for example in cases when the c and g follow r. Palatal quality owned simply how to be assumed without obvious reason. As it is we have only to assume such a general shift from gutteral to palatal quality in the words as to admit of this palatal remnant by partition. And this is to be easily accounted for by the influence of the c. g. followed by palatal vowels. and the case, where a following j has effected them.

On the other hand it forbids our definitely

assuming palatal quality for them and do by virtue
of certain positions. The similarity in many instances
of the unmistakeably palatal quality of a vowel
only when the i immediately follows it to the
preceding vowel

Mercian: The Psalter:

Palatal Umlaut:-

Zeuner (§ 8.2) assumes a breaking a > æ before h, ht + cons., and its subsequent palatal umlaut to æ (ę):-

h:- zefuęh, 18.6 etc; ęęh (het) 15.8 etc. (zeęęh 193.27) aluęęh (inf.) 50.4, ęlęh (inf.) 58.12

ht:- zedęht 12.2 etc (zedęht 70.10, zedeht 105.13 (bis)) mæht 64.7 etc. (mæhte 105.2) męhtizre, mehtizru 85.14, næht 21.3 etc. (næht 16.3 etc. nęht 6.7 etc., neht. 18.3 (bis)), hundæhtatizes 89.10, mæhte 39.13, awæhtes 190.25 etc., zeræht 140.2.

hs(x): ęcerecęex 57.4, wæx 21.15 etc, wex 61.3, wex 76.5

Note: ę is common in the preterit of bredecan aweccan, reccan. though influence of the present.

The umlaut form is æ. Note *mæht and næht above, and also hlæhhad 51.8, gedæht ende 30.14.

Now in support of our hypothesis that there

was no breaking before h, we would at once call attention to the fact that we have here ae used for the assumed palatal variant of æa, although theoretically this is equivalent to the ordinary lengthening of a, WS. North. ae., which is here invariably expressed by the e-symbol.

As we have seen nothing in Northumbrian leads us to regard the ae before h as in any wise different from the ordinary ae, so long as we accept the theory of a checked breaking. The idea is that we have recurrence to the sound with which the breaking started. But what then is then the theory of a breaking is to be classed with this ae in Po., which ought properly to appear as e. Zeuner, although he undoubtedly must have perceived this difficulty makes no reference to it. His knowledge of it however evidences itself in the carefulness with which he treats the ae before

-h.

Now what are we to make of this æ for WS. North. æ. We see at once that æ is purely or- thographic. that æ appears precisely where æ appears in other dialects. To what are we to refer its use? Here at once we may revert to our discussion of North. e for ǽ — here too in mercian we have ê for ǽ — in brief the scribe has carried over to his short æ-sound the sym- bol which he used for the long æ-sound

If this be true, what then did the symbol æ mean to him — It meant to him, and was reserved by him for the umlaut of â — that is to say a long sound, with but a few excep- tions to be noted in a moment. Now where then should we look for the long æ-symbol? Naturally before h. l. r. cons. in accordance with our

wrad. gelt. dæg. mægne. fæt. æt. dæt.

argument advanced in treating the Polish and Slov. yat again as umlaut of a before l+cons. This proves to be the fact, here merely enough that as appears. And so in the umlaut of the ae before h. l+cons., an umlaut which Zimmer does not explain.

Let us pass on now to what Zimmer considers to be a notable support of his belief in the checked breaking of a before h. l+cons. "Eine wesentliche stütze" he says "erhält die erklärung des ae and e vor h aus ea and eo durch die beobachtung dass auch vor den beiden anderen lauten, z und c, die verhältnisse ganz ähnlich liegen wenn wir hier auch nicht zu voller consequenz durchdringen können"

This comparison involves other difficulties than merely the lack of "voller consequenz". The examples he brings forward are those of the palatal umlaut of an accented e or i

of a. Leaving at one side the exceedingly delicate character of the affection of a, particularly in a paradigm where the dat. plural only has the strong guttural elements necessary, and admitting for the Po. a fairly consistent breaking of a, we must be careful to notice that the stage from which this diphthongisation started was a and not aa. Po. is as careful in its treatment of the a-aa relation as W. S. We must remember, to take Zeuner's example, that it was *dazum and not *daazum, which became *daazum. Now when the palatal umlaut by partition affected this result — was the resulting sound to be expressed by e? That would be to place the whole process on a par with a development starting from aa. What do we find? Examples of a and e

boundary extends to the true sound — they lie on either side of it — the scribe could not when careful use either his e (= W.S. æ) or his a, which happens except in a half-dozen instances only before l and o. There was only one thing for him to do, to bring in the one symbol left the æ which else where means æ and also only means the long æ.

Another point in favor of assuming a careful discrimination of the sound by the scribe is the fact of its recent appearance. Palatal umlaut of the a (difthong) produced by i umlaut cannot have long preceded the composition of this text.

To return now to Zupitza's use of the word "incorrect bisher stillzig". I certainly should have considered that because an æ is the result of a certain process in one place, it cannot

[1] Barring the unaccented at last, cured.

he argued that an aa elsewhere is the result of the same process. In that case the aa before h + cons. becomes at once suspicious. Again he should have considered that there is not necessarily parallelism between a postulated checking of an aa which came from aa, with a postulated checking of a diphthong which came from a. The actual parallel to the checked breaking before h which he postulates, he might have found in the checking of the breaking before rc, rg. This too starts from aa — but its result is not an aa as before h + cons. — it is an e. That is he postulates

*maht > *meaht > maht

and finds it supported by the development

*dazum > * deazum > dazum

Where as the only development which he might find. Compare it is

'The aa is of course only symbolic of the true sound

*hearg > *hearg > herg,

where e is obtained not as

The question has so far been argued on the supposition that Zeuner is right in ascribing no umlaut to a. That a was broken in certain cases by strong gutturals in the following syllable combinations, is indubitable. — There are unmistakable cases for example in the Kentish Charters. But if the testimony of the Glosses is to be read as indicating that u-o umlaut was even then in its inception, and if beside the non-occurrence of palatal umlaut in the Corpus we find two-thirds of the cases falling under u-o umlaut unaffected by it, we may well question whether this umlaut of a was ever regularly and generally affected by it in the Corpus despite interlining cases. These are certainly exceptional, all the more so since beside them occur a number of cases with unaffected a. And when Zeuner points thus bro

ing as general, fx and as ruling for the plural form of dæg, the propriety of the assumption is still further questionable.

Reasoning in this way, it would seem far more probable to see in these forms of dæg, lengthened forms, the length of which is due to vocalisation of g. In this light, the use of æ as a distinctively long sound is justified; possibly in the e of feger in the Lit. above, we may see a similar indication of length. The length of that text is not as characteristically a long symbol as the æ of this.

In this conclusion, two other forms offer their testimony, dæʒ 55.5, and mæʒne 64.7. In neither of these is the vowel symbol justified by ordinary usage. The former, dæʒ, helps to justify the conclusion in point reached, and in the latter it seems obvious that the vowel indicates the vocalisation of ʒ before the consonant n

We may glance briefly at the endings of the preterite, h + cons: - Zefeh (unp.) 184.19. forseh (unp.) 31.9 etc. "endlich" says Zeuner "feh, 14.5, besonders wichtig, weil es uns hier infolge des ursprünglichen e in der Endung einmal *feoh(e) gelautet haben muss: nach Zefeh und seh allein könnte man zweifeln, ob die Brechung überhaupt jemals dagewesen sei." There is a curiously illogical assumption here similar to that in his "wesentliche stütze" to the assumed breaking before h; because feah must have been feoh, and has become feh, so similarly Zefeh and forseh, he implies, must at one time have been *feoh, *seoh.); before ht: wecht 99.29 etc. ofersohte 55.4 etc., seht, 41.7 etc., the umlaut is i, - (in) sihtum 19.1. etc., unsihtsis(se) 26.1. etc. - the two markedly differ from the ae-ae relation of a in similar position.

Palatal umlaut of breaking before r :-

(ea > e); erc, 131. 8 ; ic Zesuerc (het.) 30. 13 ; herzeo 113. 46 etc., merzlice 65. 15, werz 54. 13 etc..

(eo > e); Zesuerc 147. 16, werc 8. 4 etc. (wric 16. 4) Zeberz 9. 16 etc., berzad 33. 9, duerh 77. 8 etc; berht 15. 6 etc.

Umlaut forms :- wircel 114. 2 etc., wirrnisse 106. 23 etc. Zebirhte 41. 9 etc.

"Am regelmässigsten" says Zeuner "wirkt hier der palatalumlaut auf ea und eo zurück in der verbindung mit r". This remark is significant, when it is remembered that elsewhere palatal umlaut is questioned by our hypothesis

Checking of u-o umlaut :-

The u-o umlaut of a has already been touched upon. It is not of particular interest at this point as is that of e, since cases occur where the um-

lant of e persists before z. The forms wezas
wezum attract particular attention there
are 26 forms with e, to four with eo(ea);
clearly showing disappearance of the umlant-
form through operation of palatal umlant. The
word steorzan however always shows the
eo. The form is of particular interest because
it may at once be brought into relation with
verbs of the type of sprecan, breocan, wreocan,
which regularly show the eo, over against
one or two exceptions sprecen 49.7. gesprecen
118.148. Here plainly we have a well defined
class just beginning to give way to the
general tendency.

So is everywhere checked back to i.

Palatal umlant of êa. êo:-

The checking to e is without exception. It seems
scarcely necessary to list examples. Among the

from eo, ie flēzen 54. 7, flēzende. 11. 16 may be mentioned in passing.[1] Forms with i, as in North. are not found in the cases derived from ēa. Zeuner points out that the forms atīd 9.30 and flēn 67.2 prove h to have been palatal before it disappeared. With regard to atīd, there can be no question for in North. we find h persisting in the 3d sing. of contract verbs, and that Zeuner says is presumably true of flēn, — but in North. Rit. we find the forms healmesia, heannisse, dealh, which would seem to indicate the reverse, unless we can assume a glide before the s, or some analogical influence.

[1] Sievers, § 165, Note: "We may perhaps detect traces of i as i-umlaut in Ps. tief ... yet we have also Ps. fliegen liegende, North. licht apparently without i-umlaut." This is hardly more strange than the appearance of degutha. i. In any case could not the influence of liegan be suspected

Special heightenings:-

Possible heightenings of the ae sound to e- such as we met with in North. are fortunately not observed as we might have feared there would be under the e symbol. Not only do we have the use of ae, as above commented upon, but we also find (§402.2) the forms weiz 36.5, diz 55.3, and dez 54.18, where the e is corrected from the i. Zeumer here speaks of the constant i in frizman but his examples are not in point (frizn. empirat. 13 8, 23, 199.9; frizmad 10.5). This use of i is to be regarded as an endeavor to express vocalisation of the z, perhaps suggested unconsciously by the iq suffix, and the interchange of iqe and ie.

The Consonants:-

With regard to the consonants themselves there is very little that needs to be noted.

c call. for no remark

g in auslaut never appears as h. It is comparatively rarely that it is dropped medially. Occasional cases of disappearance are found: oneednisse 115.17. toetrodne 91.10, ebylden 101 11, The ending -ize almost invariably appears as ie. The z is lacking in hlafdian 122.2 (and in urbed, reference not given)

H has been dropped in certain forms with the Lt combination — dryten 14.4, dryt 24.8, ic zehyde 118 114. zehyte 3 sg. 5.9, fyrhtu 54.5 (with h corrected). There is also introduction of the h through analogy in zefihd 20.2, zefiht 15.9, onfuehte 47.4. The preterit forms dwoz 72.13 and eloz 77.20 etc. have the z introduced from the plural.

Original j appears as usual except in zuiude 24.7 It disappears in Dreu 49.21. freod. (plural) 34.19, 36.10

In connection with the disappearance of z, note the cases above with i for e

Rushworth Gospel 2.

This text contains what must seem to be rather a mechanical admixture of different forms than what may be judged a coherent and consistent dialect. We give a brief survey of the conditions:—

A before h. h+cons.:—

conditions are the same as in North. and Po. Æ is found in both umlauted and unumlauted forms except in certain verbs where e is borrowed from the present (gedihtunge 12.14, ehtan 11.16, gereht 1.23, wehton 8.25) and in exlan 23.4, wexan 13.30, where e is for æ as in examples listed § 1. c.

A before rc.

generkade 27.66; arke 24.38 keeps it a.

A before g+an.

heage 21.33 (= heagan), certainly correct + doubtful.

E before h, h+cons.

Forms with eo appear: 29 mihte, 17 ic, 6 eo, 4 æ 3 y, 1 e.

Ę before rh, rc.

The earlier es checks to e, except in weorc 5.16. weorcae 16.27, feorh 16.25.26.

Ęi before c.g + a, o, u.

This umlaut takes place as in Po:- pleg-ade. 14.6, sprecan (Inf) 6.7. beside sprecan 12.34, sprecad 12.34 beside sprecad 10. 20 gesprecad (Plu.) 10.20. Ęa from æ only in wreogan 25.3 (Inst. Plural)

Ęa before "palatals":-

Ę occurs 72 times, ea 11 times, æ 6 times. The cases with ea are eagan 18.9 (bis), eagum 26. 43, heah 16.26, heah 24.23. Brunn explains the cases of heah as analogical. This is surely a mistake, for note examples in Orosius, where the form neh is surely not justified as a primary form. Hah is found 15.20 21.21, etc. as in other texts.

Ęo before "palatals":-

Ęo is found 14 times; e 9 times. i 8 times. Leohte

seeke, weox, and certain forms of the contract verbs supply the cases with eo. Brunn's precise reason for listing leohte light here does not appear; with unlaut, cnihtende 12.20, cilten. 23.37. General conditions.

It will be scarcely profitable to follow out the general conditions in the text, since they are only of value in their bearing on the problem of texts & dialects of which are unmistakable. Rush with 2 has undoubtedly a large infusion of W.S. forms, and it is precisely between W.S. and other dialects that we wish to discriminate.

Kentish.

The conditions in Kentish are extremely interesting, and in some ways extremely difficult to explain. The Epinal Glossary alone contains its own problems, and when the Charters are admitted in evidence, the greatest care must be taken to distinguish dialectic intermixture. It is greatly to be regretted That the evidence They afford is not more trustworthy, for in regard to one or two important points they would seem to provide us with chronological data of interest and value. Unfortunately we must necessarily begin to suspect the dialectic consistency of these documents early in the 9th century. Kent was in the hands of the West Saxons, and her churches were in the hands of West Saxons, or ecclesiastics who favored the West Saxon dominion. Sweet does not seem to have taken account of this fact as has not paid proper attention to the accuracy of his references.

The Charters.

d, e, before h. ht+cons:

a: A. weax. 459.33; gedeahte 562.11; meahcelog II. 102.10; deahtunga II. 106.28.

allmehtigum 459.8, 583.14; Suthseaxan 592.13

endsaxa II. Ath. p. ii. 3.[2]

B.1. Sexconum. 558. 1

B.2 Seaxana . 552.37

C.2. allmaehtig II. 196.32, almaehtiges, II. 309.16.

ahte II. 146.27: almahtig II. 197.3

e. A. feoh 561.5, fiah 560.20, reohte 561.7.

rehtlicast 446.12; elesexnicg, II. 314.17[3]

sex, 318.17[4], 577.2.

riht, 429.20

[1] Wrongly given by Wulff as 483.19

[2] There is no page 606 as given by Wulff.

[3] Wulff gives the reference as of the I. the date from a elesexnicg

[4] Not given by Wulff.

B.1. rehte, 293.28 etc.

B.2. riht-, II. 87.24 etc., reahte-, II. 116.2 geriaht II. 132.14

C.1. riqt II. 204.12 etc., fordrigte 58.37 etc.,

C.2. feoh II. 146.23 (a.d. 871) feos II. 196.1.2 (871 to 889): fee 147.12 (late); reht- 196.2 etc.

i.A. Uuiohtbrord 252.22, Uuiohthun 437.16 Wohthun 446.2, 451.18, Wohtred 531.38 Uueohthun. 436.38

Uuihthun. 437.16, 450.3: etc.

B.1. Ueohthun. 355.30, Wohthun 401.21 410.11, Wohthert 421.29, Wohtred 531.38 sihtre 421.7

B.2. Wohtgar II. 62.8. Hetuveox 526.10.

A. It is to be regretted that we do not possess any purely Kentish document written in the vernacular of a date prior to the 9th century. The earliest form subsaxa II. App. p. ii. 3

(616-618) cannot be adduced in evidence, since the word is possibly not native, and is presumably archaic as names are apt to be; even in pure W.S. documents we find the word without breaking, spelled as here, or with an e as in the Lutheran of 592.13.

Next in order of time is ellmehtgum 459.8 (805-810). To posit the e a palatal umlaut of ea would be to assume for Kentish a palatal affection all trace of which is lost after this date save in the ellmehtgum of 583.17 (837) and moreover would make this form irregular among non-W.S. forms, in so far as it exhibits e in place of æ.

Again - and this is a possibility though remote - the e of this form might be the i-umlaut of a breaking ea before h. In assuming this, we should have to assume on the strength

of this form alone an individual development in Kentish, i.e. breaking before h unlike Anglian with umlaut to e as before r + cons.

This is a possibility. The form however is with far greater probability to be explained as due to the use of e for æ. In regard to this point we should go far astray if we trusted to Wolff's enumeration of cases: "die kentischen Urkunden" he says "haben in der alteren Zeit nur æ. Das erste e erscheint 810 [Ket 459.37]" Just in passing we may note that hweder occurs 1446.7 (805) unnoticed by Wolff. In the document in which this form allmehtgum occurs, in which we are interested the form Ket is found of which he speaks, and one other Ketta 460.1. also listed by him. If however we should trust to his enumeration, these cases would hardly arrest attention. A glance at the document however proves Wolff derelict

He has omitted all mention of the following:- genecca 459.7, festen 459.25, agefe 457.31 (beside gefe 458.6, ageft 459.33) gedefe 457.37, messe- 460.2 (bis) hueder 460.9 surely a faulty long list for a document of 44 lines.

There are cases of short e for short æ and are given simply to avoid question with regard to the length of the e=æ in allmehtgum. For if this e (= æ) in allmehtgum is similar to that of the Anglian letters h, hr, it should accordingly not be regarded as long, and in these cases are omitted like from the document in hand: no cases of ê for â (these are not omitted by Hoff) suesendum 459,19, red 459.32, arede 466.3, - for numerous cases in other documents, see p.44.

In any case then - be the vowel long or short - it is equivalent to the Anglian æ. The same form appears 583.19 (837) where again the use of ê for â is

found: [illegible] ;—

gerece 583.30, red 584.4, medde 584.3.

Beside [illegible] melchtgunn, there occurs in the document considered a moment ago an apparent case of breaking, weax 457.33. As it stands it is a difficult form to explain :— "ac mon dat [illegible] ufe to ciricican" Possibly, the ea may be referred to the influence of the prevailing vowel in the group of reduplicating verbs into which weaxan had passed. The form in any case is anomalous.

Dutch exan, 592.13, as remarked above, is paralleled in W.S. documents. The e endin is equivalent to aa, or is a compromise between the archaic form and the feeling for the breaking. It would be interesting to know for what reason Wolff considered himself justified in regarding the document in which it occurs as pure Kentish. It is a shorter form of the Charter of Kingston; why Wolff admitted the one and this document is 838 well on in the period of W.S. dominion.

omitted the other it is difficult to understand

We come now to the forms gedachte 562. II (832 for 833), meahseelog II. 102.10 (859) and Deahtunga II 106.28. Meahseelog is plainly measeelog and should not have been classed by Wolff under this rubric. Gedachte and Deahtung remain. The etymological difficulty in Deaht has, it is believed, never been pointed out; barring the possibility of analogy (meaht?) it must be referred to a stem without infixed nasal. Leaving this on one side however, we need point out in regard to the first of these forms that in a document so late we must bear in mind the possibility of W.S. influence. This particular grant is in fact to that kingdom, generally supposed to

'Furthermore he has omitted in this document the form Mealdingas. Though a reference to the word in another document is given in the Grond B.2.

have been a W.S., who presided at the Council of Kingston.

The second form Deahtung is to be similarly considered. The document in which it occurs is referred to 833. In place of regarding it as pure Kentish, it would seem far more probable to accept it as W.S. authorship — note the forms agyfe, hyrstans, mealles, eald, cyoos, agyfe Eadhburge, hyra, sealm, asceadeu, ealles, eyst, wyscat, agife, fealdum, gif, gyl, eyle.

This sums the evidence. Disregarding these two forms, we have the anomalous weax, beside two cases of all mehtgum. From these no satisfactory conclusion can be drawn. The probability is however that Kentish did not share in the W.S. breaking of before h until possibly the period of W.S. dominion. For how nearly Sussex was hedged in by other conditions may perhaps be inferred from the group of Surrey documents C. 2, all dated after 871.

Here we have aht, almahtig, allmachtig, almachtiges.

It may perhaps be possible to ascribe more significance to the two cases of allmachtig- gum without overstepping the bounds of a proper carefulness, and for the reason. It is quite beyond probability that the e represents an i-umlaut of ea. It must then be accepted as equivalent to Anglian æ. But Mercian carefully distinguishes this æ. Hence the e must be Kentish. But it is characteristic of Kentish that it uses the e to represent even the æ from â. If dependence can be placed upon this reasoning, there would be forms proper to Kent, and the conditions would be shown equivalent to those in Northumbrian and Mercian.

The examples of e before l, l+cons., with their dates, are as follows:- Lex. 317.18 (778) rehtlicast 446.12 (805-831), 561.1 (833), Lex (577.2

(abnt 833), elesexnicq. JL. 314. 17 (923)

Fiah, 560.20. feoh 561.5. and reohte 561.7 occur in a document of the year 833. Cf. reohte with rehtlicast in the same document.

Riht 429. 20 (803) occurs in a grant made by Wercelin and Hereford (in synod) at Clarendon, to Canterbury. There is no difficulty about the form. (cf North. leht) but it is scarcely apparent upon what grounds Wolff admitted this grant as pure Kentish. It belongs more probably under B.1. if it merit admittance at all.

In four documents it will be seen we have forms preserving the e. There are prior to 833 when we find in the same document reohte beside

"This extremely peculiar form is in a Latin document :- quorum haec sunt nomina: ab orientale clivo ... ab occidentale capite scala."

Particularly as all the English it contains is "Into Winchcumbe acire. Feorm riht of Cellan ha. of Burcan forda"

rehtlicant. This would certainly seem to indicate a retention of the e in early Kentish. The striking harmony of the groups A and B.2 c. apparent. It is fortunate that in A. we have the forms with e, and not with the ambiguous i of B.1. B.2. C.1. The forms in C.1. are peculiar with their uniform i and their use of g for h., — and it might be suggested that these "Surrey" documents should be in better harmony with groups A. and B.2: Wolff in his Concluding remarks says of them, (h 70) "Die wenigen Urkunden von Surrey sind dadurch auffallend, dass sie in den lautlichen Entwickelungen vor den anderen Dialekten weit voraus sind." The fact of the matter is that these "Surrey" documents are two only, the elder (H. 58. A.D. 675) being a grant by Frithewald sub-regulus of the Mercian King Wulfhere ('Wlferus') and the other (I. 204, circa 891) a grant by King Alfred 'Saxonum rex'

'This illustrates how purely arbitrary Wolff's divisions often are.

The use of i in Mercian documents and documents presumably Mercian is noteworthy when compared with either the earlier Kentish forms on the one hand or the Psalms on the other both of which have e. Rush. 2 has 17 cases of i to 29 of e – but this does not lessen the surprise of finding an i in a grant by Frithuwold dated 675; this is however but a single word in a single document, and it is possible does not indicate so early a heightening of the e. The next case 417.20 (cited by Wolff under A) is 803, and all the others are 10th century.

The cases of the breaking of i attract our attention. for one certainly is early (Winchcombe 252. 22) and the question instantly arises why we do not have palatal umlaut; no matter what theory may be held with regard to a and e, i is here what would be expected. No doubt, being in a proper name, this is a crystallised form

Regarding the origen of the ie, a another question. It is W.S. and not found elsewhere, and in W.S. whether the i be regarded as long or short may be placed beside betweox, betwine, , betweonum. wuht, leoht. wiotan

The Glosses:-

A. e. before h. h + cons: - Epinal (a) leax 12 / 11; leactrogas 8 / 34 (247)

ambechtae 7 d 11 (187); ambect 22 d 8 (866); arectae 7 d 36 (-). brectne 24 b 23 (928); nectigalae 16 b 15 (-); nectugalae 22 b 27 (-)

naechtraebn 16 b 15, 18 (-). aehtath 21 d 14 (836) aex 1 d 10 (13).

Leorpus: - leactrogas 14.35 (540)

naect-, 31.13 etc. (-). naeht- 34.21 (-) braechtme 48.21 (1911); aehtad 39.13 (1570) gelaechtnad 25.28 (-); thachtmae 1745 (772)

ambaact 43.5 (501) ; aex 8.10 (259),
aexfarm 6.22 (–) ; aex 16.31, (625)
blod-aex 22.33 (671) ; leohsaex 116.13 (
waexcondel 23.37 (–) ; laex 28.37, E.S. 19.40
(767) ; faextaelg 23.28. (364?)

Ruehl 17.5. (–) forsliet 28.16 (–).

Epfnät: – leactrogas c. 239

aechtath p 420, nęcte a 83, tunaex
a 49, nethraebn n. 19, bretme s. 133,
necegle, r. 11 (lex. Sbed. 555)

e: – Epinal: – gifect 18 b 11

Corpus: – gefeht 38.21, ceahcneht 19.15

Erfurt: durhgifecilae p. 38 (= dorhgifeht)

i: no cases given.

The others in uniform evidence with regard to
a before h + cons. shows two exceptions, laex,
and leactrogas.

Reference to Epinal and the same in Sweet as to Erf.

These are to be explained as follows. Leac-trogas, from the Latin lactuca, undoubtedly shows the influence of leac. This is the more evident as it forms the the single case of apparent breaking in Leorpus and Erfurt. Leax is probably due to the transposition of the letters e and a (cf. numerous errors listed by Sweet) perhaps to oversight of scribe in working together his material. Certainly in Leorpus and Erfurt the word appears as lacx and lex.

In the other forms we have e and æ to deal with. This e is to be considered equivalent to æ, cf. examples p. §6.2, and note naecht-beside nect-. That is, the forms yield similar evidence to that found in the Anglian

cf. lēac, lēac-caerse, lēachtmeard, lēacweard.
= Not given by Dieter.

texts. We may remind ourselves here of the Kentish use of ē for ēa, of which mention has already been made. We should expect in Epinal as here throughout. The æ in ambechtæ, ambeht is readily to be paralleled even in W.S. (Aelfred etc). That of rectme and brectme is due to interchange of e and æ as appears in neect beside neet. The cases in Corpus have æ throughout like the Mercian, except in leachrogas shaken of above, duehl (A.S. dwéal, dwǽlan, dwalhal) and forsheit, the doubling of which for these texts is anomalous.

Psalm: (a) meahtig, 73.136. ælmeahtig 86.78. meahta 89. leahtra 145. mæahtig 155. — mæhtig 63. 141. 149. ælmæhtig 130. mahte 118. mehtig 90. 176. elmehtig 34. elmehtig 78.

Hymn: — meahtig 32. leahtrum 34. leahtgesmiz

hæftcolle, 24, mæstlum 12, ofmodlic 911.

Juditha Glos:— wreccad 116 3, gereahte 103, 137, areahtum 379, geteaht 171, mid wæta as in MS. unsleac 140, scleacnes 694, ic gemyrred mid ælacad 318, âscûfa cad. 696, to-slacad 638, (with umlaut) slehð, slehst; hlihhan 11. 1150.

With e: meht § 2, awehte 526.

e: Psalm:— unriht 37.43.88, unrihtum, 61, rihtre, 93

Hymn and Glos afford no examples.

These texts are practically equivalent to W. S. texts, particularly the Psalm and Hymn, since the later Glos is distinguished by marked Kentiscisms (e for y. ê for âê < a etc.).

[1] These, from with heah are included, doubtfully because the affricate Wulfi's test.

A. e. before r. l. + c. q. h.:

The charters:-

(a) A. mearc-, I. 318.17; II. 202.5.6.7(bis); Mealh 445.30[1]. Ealhhring 561.11. Alhstan 564.34.

B. 1. mearce 467.35, 293.32 etc., mearcfleot 485.23, ealhfleot 447.3, Healh 483.23, Ealhmundi 254.27. 259.8.

Æthheard 345.13, Aghheard 355.27, Aðhmund 401.23 etc., Alhfleot 491.31[2]

B. 2. mearc II. 47.17 etc.; sealces II. 463, 26; fealcnes, II. 220.14, fealcing II. 573.17; Ealhstan 551.24, Alahfredingden 553.2.

Uualhard 337.15, Alter II. 47.4.

l:- A.-berhtus 7.17 etc.[4]- berct. 68.16. Dene berht

[1] This document (No. 318. 805-831) is not in Wolff's list though he uses it.

[2] Omitted by Wolff.

Omitted by Wolff. Geni. in -es & -e where it is spelled with a c. [illegible]

[4] Wolff's reference is wrong - 7.11.

445.34. Verenberht 445.36, Berhthard 435,12,
Berhtwaldus 144.21 etc., Berhthod 445.32

Beorht-, II. 201.31: (with umlaut) Mæremyrht
435.25 etc. Byrhtmund 435.35. — also cases with
metathesis, Brytmaldi 107.34, etc.

Berad 234.32

B.1. geweorc 344.12, - beorht 343.11 etc.
B.2. beorges 584.4, brork II. 403.18 etc.

(According to this evidence, Kentish, like W.S. did
not know this form of palatal umlaut, or at
least its appearance was sporadic. Regarding the
use of beorht, Wulff says, "Mit berht gebildete
Eigennamen bewahren e meist, wenn berht
zweites Glied der Zusammensetzung ist: Einwirk-
ung des Palatals. Als erstes Glied erscheint häu-
figer Beorht, wohl infolge des stärkeren Tones.
This assumption of a palatal umlaut dependent
upon quantitative conditions is novel and uncalled
Omitted by Wulff.

fwr. Words frequently appear without breaking as second elements of compounds; the presence of a palatal has nothing to do with it e.g. -weard ; -ward.

The testimony of B.1. under the a-forms is particularly noteworthy. Though undoubtedly documents with Mercian colouring, yet the forms they afford absolutely contradict Mercian Ps., This is strong evidence towards the conclusion that the palatal umlaut of the breaking before r was extremely rare or sporadic in Kentish.

The Glosses: -

Epinal:

(a) :- fristmearc. 12 d 30 (–), mearisern 8 d 35 (–), mere[a]rgrod 96 28 (409), fealga 116 19 (713) &c.

faerh 20 b 18 (811), maerh 13 f. 3 (588).

Corpus :- waergrood. 23.23 (930) : haerg 31.11 (1255) hargo 44.32 (1772); fristmaerc 27.31 (-); gemaercode 28.2 (1121); ebaerca 46.8 (1324) maerh : 40.21 (1616); maerh 31.5 (153) ea (horse) Maerh baerh 29.32 [308+5]

merg. 32.29 : meraiseren 10.33 (352)

Erfurt: maergrod f.30; maerc l.103; maerh l.72, fferh f.270, merisaerm c 205.

(e). Epinal:- werci 16f 40(.14); duerg 16d6 (686), 20d 11 (-), berc 6b4. (352) Ithuerhfyri 23 b12 (-); elch 8f 11.(233) 26f.37(1041): aceelhegi 26 b.15 (-);

Corpus: duerg 33.42 (1362), duered-ethe 42.23 (-), duerc 50.17 (1994), werci 36.8 (1450), aalgewerc 26.5 (1940). geberg H 3.14 (1715), 35.23 (1426); ferht H1.16 (l.s. ferahte) (1639), midferh 29.3; duerhfyri 44.21 (1761), elh 12.30 (443), elch 51.36 (2054) aceelhege 49.3 (-) [berc. 293]

~~berca 29.3~~ (285) algiuerc [ee] rc 12f.12;

Erfurt:- berc b.18, werci o39: duerg-n 48, n 302; Ithuerh o 3, algiuerc i 122, 56 elch c 262, t 77, aceelhegi o. 362.

The cases of the a breaking in Epinal are inte-

worthy; ea is preserved except before rh. We must perforce regard this as a "shield der Zufalls" as Breier does, in spite of which we are prepared to assume that the qualities of the e and g differed from that of the h. Turning to other evidence of the e-breakings that a berc is the only satisfactory case of palatal umlaut and it is rendered more than doubtful by the form aceolhegi, and by the fact that the omission of the second element of the diphthong by scribal error is by no means rare. Seven cases of words with êa before c. g. retain the ea, to first such as. But these talles are far from satisfactory, since they are paralleled in the forms with ea, or else are customary spellings, as in Ac. 21 f. 18

Were we not obliged to distrust the ex-

In six cases against ten there is omitted:- herth, ferth, ferred, sifunsterri, sherwi (for emerwi), swerelleri.

amples under e because of the presence of w. and the general uncertainty of the orthography, we would be in a position to assert that the c and g had not become as positively palatal as in the other texts. We would argue that in the case of the eo, monophthongisation took place through conjunction of the consonants and the strongly palatal fricit element of the diphthong. In the case of ea, with the weaker o as fricit element, this does not take place. The result of this would be — and it may possibly be true — that Epinal would be proved to stand in point of time relatively near the inception period of the general palatal affection. Erfurt, it will be remarked has e, as Hatton at.

The forms in Corpus. are further evidence of its Mercian colouring.

The remaining texts are without notable

forms. The Psalm has consistently eo, also before r+ cons. (Wulff. p. 27). The Hymn affords no examples. Zupitza's Glossary has turbt 508, classed by Zupitza under umlaut of ea, though it would certainly seem to be parallel with German. Zergen.

U and o umlaut in words with medial c.g:

a. A. Heortleagu 142.8, 364.23 (765-791); Reacolrensae 462.10 (801); cf. Theabne 142.8 (797).

Raculf 130.7 (796 x 716); Raculfe 249.8 (741), 252.31; Raculfcestre 377.26 (747); Racuelf 528.18 (825); cf. Hadoredus, 436.16. (803)

B.2. raculfunga, 538.31.34

e. A. foreshreoca 576.18 (833) reogolwarde 459.32 (805 x 810); reogolweard 459.38 (805 x 810)

*Mistaken reference in Wulff, carried over from Sweet's Ms. The previous word. At 364.23 it is spelled with a small letter.

= Given by Wulff without a question.

b.2 forcofrec, II. 196. 29 (871 × 889)

i. B.2. stiogole, II. 114. 11. (862)

The earliest cases of Racnef it will be observed (716-747) are without u-umlaut, while in the next later (811) we have Reacol- and in the latest (875) Racnef. Taking the earliest date assigned as possible for the ort-leagu (765) and comparing Theabul (697), we should have if this testimony is reliable, a chronological datum for the inception of u-o umlaut in Kentish, namely that it began to operate about the beginning of the 8th century. The forms with o do not contradict this; the only point noticeable is that cfreocan should keep its eo so late as 833 (note also stiogole) at a time when we find Racnef. The form Racnef is noteworthy. When W.S. influence came in, its tendency would not be to affect the diphthong in a

place-name like this, where in a common word it might substitute its own unaffected vow-el. But in the place of the fuller Raculf, we now have Racnulf — and this is the transition form to the modern Raculver. This palatal umlaut by partition must be set on the evidence for the first half of the 9th century.

The Glosses:-

a. Epinal:- aslacundae 11 b 34 (491); ragu 14 f 17 (629); haca 20 b 9 (803); lundlaga 22 b 18 (850); borohaca 26 f 30 (997); together with ten other cases without medial gutturals all unbroken. To Dietz's list must be added lacur 455, haezthorn 18. 803, slezu. 460.

Corpus: heagadorn 11.38; reagufinc 8.35; heagueken 24. 11; weagat 19. 27, moocan 17.29 (i 2/3 der fälle ist a bei dunkelem wokal der folgenden silbe erhalten Sievers, p. 31.

aeclacade 25.22 ( ), ragu 33.3 (1329)
lundlaga 43.11 (1712), gagulsuille 23.41 (–)
maga 48.39, (1934) draca 51.6 (2024)

Erfurt: aeslacudae fr 7, ragu m 41,
lundlaga. r 2.

e.i: In Epinal. there are unbroken.

Leorpus: Breaking frequent, nom cases mit
c.g.h.

Erfurt: Breaking rare, no cases with
c.g.h

The Epinal it will be seen is without æ-o
umlaut of a. Possibly in haezithorn 18, 803
elezu 460, we may see an attempt to repre-
sent its beginnings, as also in libr baeppan
263, scaedugeardas 836, sunal hebrae 3524.
Of course, as Zimmer points out p. 35 Anm., not palatal
umlaut. for there is no i-e umlaut of a in the first place, i
in the second this æ is found before other consonants,
as see above.

Now indubitably if u-o umlaut were anywhere to be met with, it would be found in the case of e and i, — and here as noted we have unbroken vowels. except in Zeolus 898. as against Zelus 249, 290, 316. etc., a case apparently where initial z has aided the u-o umlaut, as in the cases in Northumbrian. Furthermore the cases pointed out by Dieter — unsend 6 d 27 sinnwurbul 27 d 26 undubil 9 d 29 uuluc 12 f 13 are to be taken into consideration. Then as he says "wesen ... in of einige grössere ausdehnung der brechung" but not in the sense necessarily that the diphthong was once well defined and that monophthongization has taken place, trace of which is retained by the influence of the w. Rather we must believe there was a regular and general diphthongization of e and i (as in W. S) and

that for some reason it has not left its witness in the orthography. This reason is not far to seek. Eo is of the rarest occurrence. Even before r + cons. it is often lacking (see above). Even the long ēo is anything but strongly defined: - eu occurs, io, once ǣo, and a number of times the familiar ea. The eo of the u-o umlaut (certainly less strongly defined than that before r + cons.) did not then force its way into orthographic representation. The omission of the glide was not matter of serious importance - with the cases where w preceded however, it was a different matter. There the clearly-marked qualitative change of the stressed element in such words as wundubil, demanded orthographic recognition.

The notable cases in Corpus of u-o umlaut of

[illegible] intervening e.g. attract attention.
The explanation is simple — namely that
c and g at the date of the Corpus had
not so far lost their guttural integrity
through the influence of the e and i of the word
as to effect palatal umlaut by partition.
Certainly this is not to be wondered at in the
case of texts so early as the Ps. and the Glosses.

The Psalm. Hymn. and Zupitza Gloss afford
no examples of the u-o umlaut of a. Two
examples of it occur with c.g. intervening. The
Psalm has the following cases with e:— breogo.
50, weogas 106. brega 2. It will be remarked
that breogo and weogas keep their diphthongs
just as in the Charters. foresprecca, steigole.
But the monophthongization has begun, in stora
brega. 2.

Ea before c. g. h:—

Th. Haarlem, A: Brentingesleag 207.8 (124) Disnheahac[1] 230.15 (138). Denaheah 249.8 (747); Beagnoth 252.25 (762 for 747) Beagnoth 252.25 (762 for 747) Heahberht 252.30 (circa 747) Heaberhte 274.17 (762) Tidheah. 274.18. (762), Daeiheah 405.31 etc.[3] (798) Healfred 437.19, (803) Bryththeah 452.7 (circa 805) Aethelheah 464.15 (811), Beagmund 524.1 (824 for 834) Teage 559.2 (830 for 832) Biornheah 561.17 (833) Tunidteaganhrucge 576.16[4] (838) Lea II. 202.13 (884) Heagyle[5] 446.22 (805). Aegera 459.26 (805×11)

[1] Hot. leah 207.9 as Wulff has it

[2] Wulff gives this as Deinheahae (!)

[3] Wrongly given by Wulff as 405.29.

[4] Omitted by Wulff.

[5] Given by Wulff as Heagyde (!).

OC 459.33.34,37, 460.7 (801 × 810) · Hæfenlt 477.32 (813) Hæhenlt 531.24 (825), Bagg-mund 584.8 (837), 589.22 (838)

B.1. Tideslæah 443.13.17. (804) læah 450.32, (805) læage 467.35 (811) mearatæag 474.11 (811), æac 477.4 (812), hearðingalæag. 480. 11 (?) longanlæag 480.13 (814), læa. 518.38. 39, læah 518.41 (bork 824) Mentalæa 530. 4.21 (825) wambelæa 535.6.17 (825)

Uelhhæah 444.4[1] (814) Uclæh 449.27.(805) Lehæ[illegible] 467.37 (811) Ragmund 532.25, Bagg-suiþ 532.39 (825). Hryðeræh 451.26

B.2. Heah I. 585.5 (838, Leoratlæag II. 18.22 (843)-læag II. 18;12,19[1=] (843). Brontæag II. 61.23[2] (855 for 853?) Læah cadelanlæge II 114.21 (862) III. 109.1.[3] (860 862), -læag II 113.28, 114.4.8.16 (862) Mæn-widan læh II 113.20; -læh II 113.25 (834) læaginga II. 114.9. (862). fearnlæge II. 220.12 (898) -læag-. II. 458.16 (434). Adelstanlæ II. 497.14 (941)

[1] Given by Wolff as 444.11

[1=] Omitted by Wolff

[2] Given by Wolff as II. 61.22

[3] Given by Wolff as II. [illegible]

[4] Given by Wolff as 458.17.

[=] Equivalent to compound

b.1. Leige 58.12.13, leage 58.31, Leah 117.26.35.
leghe 58.31

b.2. Lac II. 197.1

According to this testimony — from A + B.1 — checking to ae.e is sporadic, and occurs about the year 800. The mere neglect of the gender in the second element of a compound is of course not to be considered. The long strongly marked distinction did not yield readily to this affection; and therefore is closely comparable to that of the diphthong from a-e umlaut. These sporadic cases would hardly merit mention, were it not that the change corresponds so closely, in point of time, with that of the diphthong from a-e umlaut.

The Glosses:-

Epinal;- randbeag 6 d 11 (103), leag 13 f 6 (9.), gecaes 2 d 7 (—), and leac 22 d 15 (64)

teac 25 b 18 (961), sigbeacn 26 f 19 (1112),
bradaeleac 23 f 3 (-).

aec 21 f 18 (846), herebaecon 24 b 8 (1119)
laec 2 d 6.8 (64), leç 1 d 27 (-); ê i ê-
gan 28 d 31.[1] (1093)

leorpus: - geac 24.17,[(1465)] healecas 7.13 (-1
aec 42.33,[(1495)] laec 5.35. 7.23 etc.[(1541)] caecbora
6.12(?),[1] gaec 16.24.[(761)] gaecas 3.22; herebaecun 49.36[73]
rind baeg 16.3 (153), baeg 29.16 (-), waebtaeg
30.29 (1913a), baeg 33.18 (1339), flaeh 42.26 (1683)
haehreedlum 42.1 (-), haehmaere 49.24 (1960)
onlaec 43.24 (62),

graeleac 4.37 (113), sigelecn 51.25 (2043)
herebenc 47.16 (1873), egan 53.38 (2133),

Erfurt: andleac r 38 (-), beanc t 59.
te aeg. o. 245

aec q 11. laec a 162. laeg l 75. rindbraeg b 64, aegan
v. 65, bradelec. s. 73, gecneeorcraeda. 161, herebecn
o 117.

[1] Dieter refers here to his § 21. He presumably means § 22. I.

Ethical Keeps the ea in 5 cases, and displays palatal umlaut in 6. These cases are, as already stated, not wholly satisfactory. We have the familiar spelling æsc; læsc, læc, beside læsc; bæcen beside bræcen. We cannot assume here a transition period, but must assume a diversity due either to non-assimilation of his materials by the scribe, or local conditions.

Leofrus exhibits a uniformity that lends still stronger presumption to the conclusion of its Mercian colouring.

The Psalm has æc. 89, elsewhere ea.
Zupitza Ælsæes (p.5) here Smegan 93 3, Seh 1034, elsewhere ea. These cases may very probably as Zupitza supposes be scribal inaccuracies, but are comparable with the sporadic cases of palatal umlaut found in the Charters in documents of the 9th century.

Palatal umlaut of êo

No case before c. g. h, occurs in the charters.

Epinal :- buturfliogae 206-27 (817)

Leorpus :- flege. 33.33, 37.31 (1354); leahtfast 29.35 (1)

Once eo. leohsaex 46.13 (629)

Erfurt :- buturfliogo h. 279

Épinal Glosses :- dêohlum

These cases require no comment.

Special heightenings :-

Interchange of ae and e renders the discrimination of special heightenings somewhat dubious. In the following cases however the use of e for ae deserves mention :- A. deg 576.37, 577.3, dei. 560.13, 588.21, 23.25., 584.1.3 : dege 560.15; 561.4; 576.11; 583.17 : mege 575.16; megen 583.24; Ps. 2. dege II 195. 22, 196.28 : Hymnus : fegere. 43 (q. also later)

1 Wulff chooses to classify them here.

2 Note that in Wulff's list of cases with e for ae that the word bet should be inserted before (conj.) and also that there are a number of mistakes in his references.

The Breakings.

We may glance for a moment at the breakings before r and l in order that we may compare Kentish with the other dialects.

Breaking before r is practically without exception, forwardon 459.9, reogolwarde 457.32, reogolweord 457.8, showing the influence of the w. In unstressed syllables we find, as Wolff points out, a and ea beside each other in the earlier documents, but from the 9th century on almost exclusively ea, a fact which seems to evidence W. S. influence. Wolff is indubitably mistaken in saying, "Die Monophthongierung > æ (später > a) ist schon früh festzustellen; schon 696 begegnet æ in Haordred 132.15". In his list he gives this case and Bernhaordi 142.7, 143.17, — all of them probably isolated forms, banked in on both sides by numerous cases of a and ea. If they represent anything they represent a compromise between

the a and ea forms.

In the case of a before l + cons., we find the a preserved in the 8th century except in wealde. 207.16 (124), Mercian documents 275.17 (165) Eadulfe 227.28 (138); B.1. Ealhmunde 254.27, (148) 259.8 (155 × 157). Wealde is the only word not a proper noun found with ea before 832 in the group A, and in the same document it is paralleled by wald. Taking all the forms and occurrences together, the relations are as follows:-

	a	ea	æ
A. Previous to 800	6	2	3
After 800	22	22	1
B.1. Previous to 800	9	6	0
After 800	11	12	2

B.2, C.1. and C.2. confirm the conclusion that the breaking before l was much less common in Kentish than in W.S, C.2. noticeably having, according to Wolff's list 12 cases to 2. In Epinal a remains

with but one doubtful exception (Leofgyo 176 17 (113) where the influence of g+a is to be considered. Corf. us and Erfurt have a only. Psalm has 14 cases with a to 10 with ea; Hymn has 2 to 4; Epinal Glosses have 4 to 13.

Warranted by these facts in the belief that Kentish tended to retain a, certainly to a much greater degree than W.S., and that the predominance of ea was a feature of W.S. influence, we may conclude that the tendency of Kentish was to preserve the guttural and labial quality of the sounds, rather than to permit it to take on palatal quality as in W.S. This difference is consonant with and helps to explain why Kentish, in contrast with W.S., displays in these earlier documents no initial palatal diphthongisation.

The Umlauts.

The Charters show no cases of the i-umlaut

of ea, except in Scirierdi 145.3, eyfle II. 107.2, (B.2) yrfe II. 459.13, 520.2. 539.25, rifewyrde II. 551.19, B.2., befirfe II. 146.26 (All but the dubious first case are late, and the majority are in Saxon Kentish documents (B.2). The regular sumlaut, attested by numerous cases, is before r. e; before l, w and e; similarly, in the Glosses — save that Corpus has once ie in gierende 60.9. Zupitza Glosses have ea.l. except hlihhan 11. 1150, and (as it would seem here wrongly listed by Zupitza) tirht 508.

The ie from e does not appear in the Charters; in Epinal we find ie, in the following cases: — feriet 13 f. 11 (595), ofierman 24 & 30 (733), ge or-mierdid 26 f. 14 (998), and mit then bismiridae 12 & 14. (534) Corpus has i in gesmirwid 17.40, (670) gesmir-bet 19.13, (1401) firetbraf 29.18, (-) e in werdat 35.31, serwend. 15.31 (-) ea in fearet 41.6, (-) gewarhte 5.22, (-) ea in hierde 9.23, 13.31. 38.11; (-) ey in weyrdo 28.20, (-) georwyrde 57.23. (2042)

Labial influence appears in certain of these words but not in others. The whole question of the so-called i-umlaut of eo needs examination. Cosijns position that there was not an eo before i to be umlauted certainly seems theoretically correct; the umlaut was an umlaut of io. For our purposes we need not go further into the matter. It is sufficient to have shown that ea did not undergo umlaut to the ie; that is there was not the general tendency to palatal brightening that there was in W. S. The matter of the i-umlaut of éo is passed over; so far as the effect of umlaut is discriminated, it is expressed in the relation éu — iu

Concerning the umlaut of o, Wolff says (p. 39) that the few examples indicate that oe was the older form, e the later. This conclusion is undoubtedly correct. Wolff might have pointed out that certain of the forms (e.g. [illegible]

832) indicate possibly a retention of the labial quality of the o to a late period. The ô's of all origins similarly have the umlaut oe. A quantitative comparison with W.S. is of course impossible, but the oe forms seem, as elsewhere in non-W.S. texts to be more numerous than in the early W.S. texts.

Finally êa throughout all the texts (except the late Junius Glosses, which is affected by W.S.) umlauts to ê, âê (= ê), not to W.S. iê, ie.

In brief, the umlauted forms generally stand on a plane with the Anglian forms not with the specially heightened forms of W.S.

We pass now to make note of the conduct of the consonants in themselves, before taking up apart the general question of palatal umlaut in Kentish:—

C:— Concerning c. nothing is to be noted except that it is occasionally spelled k as elsewhere.

and that it appears ephenthetically in sclat, Corpus 12.20 ( ). asclacadon 18.11 ( ). aclacade 25.22 ( ). as contrasted with slaec, slaec elsewhere found. The meaning of this c it is difficult to understand, except it be purely orthographic due to the frequency of the sc combination. We certainly cannot argue a definite šč sound, carried over to other combinations with o, for we have no evidence of initial diphthongisation

c:— A number of interesting forms where g has disappeared are afforded by the Charters, a number of which have been given above.

The ludicrous error referred to above, where Wolff has mistaken a Middle English addition to a deed for true Anglo Saxon, reaches here its highest pitch of absurdity in his statement that the earliest case of the vocalisation of g occurs in the year 675. The form to which he refers, were

58.8. is three lines below the name of "sire Geffrey" Later he refers to the dropping of g in landemere referring to this document and to II. 203.33, (No. 563. about 889.) which is no less palpably a Middle English or Late Anglo-Saxon addition to an original grant. Again he places side by side the forms denimam II. 146.27, engs II 141.16 engmam II. 147.19 with no remark regarding the fact that the first only is from an Anglo-Saxon document, the other being from a 12th century copy.

Wolff omits to give a reference for heora. a form which may be recommended to the attention of those who claim a short i in between-times.

Particularly interesting is the interchange of g and w in higan 575.31, hiwan II. 107.4 higum 459.32, etc., hiwum 560.8. II. 107.21, hywum II. 196.28, hiawum II. 154.16. Dennis

refers (173. Note 2.) to the insertion of w in forms like reich, rîwes. to prevent hiatus, though he says it might be grammatical change. Certainly here, we are not dealing with grammatical change; the actual vocalisation of the g appears in Leiden 563. The insertion of the w before the ē. of the ending is a natural consequence. Reference may be made here to the form sīwēc for gesēc in the Rituale, and it would certainly seem that if on this principle an explanation might be offered for the word, neowol.

"Bruff refers in neither a curious way to cg for g after n as gemination" in der Nasalverbindung: cgning [where is the gemination?], cgnegeo." Again, no references with regard to this important use of c for g; the following have been gathered — the list of course does not pretend to be exhaustive.

Sincggewint 563.10, Sricq II. 107. 3, ge-
sincgo 533.2, cyninc q II. 202.29. cyninc-
ges 485.20, cyncges 486.36, cincges,
II. 577.20.23; Hymn. cyninge 15, heah-
cyninc 42.

Turning now to the Glosses, (Dieter §47) we find in
evidence of the realisation of the g, the forms
grei 1C (11 (473), bodgi 24 and 1C (—);
there are exceptional in the sense that the g is
generally retained orthographically. In
Corpus we must certainly infer disappearance
of the g in sneig 13.36 (495), greig 21.33
(850), seign 52.37 (2093) when we place them beside
cases of actual disappearance such as -grei
22.2 etc. (167), eil 33.16 (1331) [Sk 174], hoei 37.41 (1516)
roei 10.31 (—). There occur beside bodeg,
popaeg, etc. showing the influence of a traditional
orthography.

In the Glosses there are to be found

cases of the disappearance of the g before vowels
Epinal
:- faedum 19 f.33 (797), stridae 23 f 18 (- -
W.S. atregde. note the i for e), snel, 1469. (217)
stræl 16 39 (9), cnioholaen 22 d 39 (-)
Corpus: gehydnis 36.7.(-), sile 21.17 (834)
ingensette 35.12 (-), cnoholen 44.16
(880) [etrel. 907]
(-), finilae E.S. 22.15; The g has also
(765, 1023)
disappeared in sil 19.39, 25.32, dinas 30.
39.(-)

The use of c for g appears in the Corpus in
duerc 50.17 (-), in inclatinc 33.36 (-)
wi cinc ceastan 39.23 (-) leg for c in cncgeota
is probably error (42.18), as also the c for g in
hraecl; Epinal 2 f.8 (-), brocdostlendi 1867(-)

G in neither Epinal nor Corpus appears finally
or before t as h. as elsewhere. In the Charters
there is frequent interchange, - leag 207.8 (724)
-leah 452.7 (803 x 805), etc. 3. Here this means sub-
stitution of sonant for surd, and vowel indi-

(particularly considering the use of g elsewhere) an advance towards vocalisation which should be followed by omission of all diacritical whatsoever. This is the case. In the year 824 we find, besides the interchange of leag and leah, the forms lea : —^ hytlea 578. 39 (824), Wemba lea 530. 4. 21 (825, etc. lea II. 202. 13 (889), feo II. 196. 1. 2. (871 x 889) etc. lea. 518. 38 (824),

Besides these the forms with g and h continue. Upon this evidence g medial is to be accepted as often — particularly after i — merely orthographic, and the same view must necessarily be held of h, and g. The precise limits and period of the vocalisation are not to be determined. Theoretically we must suppose disappearance first of nasal after being palatal — and of this as we have seen we have evidence — and gradually after the others. Later in its inception would come the intervocalic vocalisation, and its resulting

development of w-forms through hiatus conditions. The case of w for g noted above is in a document of the third quarter of the 9th century.

H: In the Cotharlius beyond the interchange of g and h just treated, h calls for no remarks.

In Epinal, h was evidently an ambiguous symbol. It still appears in intervocalic positions, besides forms where it is dropped. It could here have been no more than a breath at best, and for the usual h before t, we find the stop c used, beside ch. Ch also appears in the majority of cases where other texts have th, h being found only after l and r with the exception of fleah 20 b 23 (c 13), throh 22 d 24, (874). [illegible] has slagh 1t gram 25 b 11 (287). These differences are evidently only orthographic.

Corpus occasionally retains intervocalic h. C for h before t [illegible]

Otherwise the forms call for no remarks. The use of the symbol ch must be regarded as a borrowing from the Latin. The absolutely arbitrary interchange of c. h and ch before t can only mean that the sound produced, if the aspirant is sounded at all, was identical.

It now remains to take note of the general evidence concerning palatal sound to be gathered from the Charters, as compared with the Glosses.

The necessity and possible advantage of this will appear when it is remembered that the evidence which the Charters and the Epinal afford possibly goes back to the period before palatal sound; and it is also to be remembered that in turning up Kentish documents, we are very near to W.S. Territory, where

the workings of palatal umlaut have been much more confined and restricted than elsewhere; a dialectic feature which may also be characteristic of Kentish.

It is to be regretted that examples are not more numerous, — it is also to be regretted that after the beginning of the 9th century we have the disturbing element of W. S. influence to consider. Conclusions, however, hypothetical and fragmentary, are worth while by way of tests of general results and possibly by corroborating one another may afford results of a very positive and valuable character.

In the first place, whatever view be taken regarding the conduct of a and e before h + cons., the examples are too few and too doubtful to afford any conclusion regarding palatal umlaut.

In the case of a before r + c. g. the testimony

seems to be unmistakable that Kentish retained the ea; not only the cases in group A are to be considered but also those in group B, which must necessarily be Kentish forms. These do not follow the testimony of the Ps. or Corpus. This would indicate the retention of ea certainly to the third quarter of the 8th century.

The cases of e unfortunately are limited to the word beorht, the testimony of which is rendered dubious by its frequent use in the second elements of ~~dupla~~ compounds. More decisive evidence not contradicted by that of A is afforded by group B., where examples are given showing the retention of the eo throughout the 8th century.

The testimony of Epinal is that the breaking is retained except before h. The evidence with regard to e is dubious, and perhaps indicates the working of palatal umlaut.

Palatal umlaut of the ea from a-c umlaut

seems unmistakable in Rood of (825), and is confirmed by the modern Kentish. On the other hand the curious retention of eo by spreocan. reogul and strogulð can only be explained on the theory of a tradition undisturbed by palatal umlaut; the forms are certainly not W. S., and shared by Kentish have surrendered the diphthong. The tradition is probably Mercian.

Palatal umlaut and u-o umlaut do not come into conflict in the Glosses.

The retention of the eo appears in the Psalms. in breogo 50, weogas 106. beside breg a. 2. showing that the umlaut possibly was at work.

In the case of the long ēa. we have ea invariably until the first quarter of the 9th century. The curious feature of the case is the sudden appearance at this time of sporadic cases of umlaut — four cases of hæa, hæah. two cases of hæh. hēh. three cases of Bēag. Thus

all occur between 804 and 838. The evidence of Epinal is to the retention of the diphthong.

This sums the evidence, and its result is to the effect that the reduction of diphthongs by palatal umlaut is not found anywhere before the first quarter of the 9th century, except in a few doubtful cases of ea paralleled by others with the full diphthong, which are found in Epinal.

The bearing of this on the uniform appearance of æ, e before h + cons. in Epinal, (two apparent exceptions explained above), if the e before h + cons. in the Epinal, of the clear cases of e before h, h + cons. in the Vocabularies (see early - the first form with eo is 833), is apparent. Scanty as the evidence is it all points in one direction — namely that the æ and e found before h + cons. are original.

West Saxon.

We reach now the dialect whose forms have been taken as the norm throughout the wide field of Anglo-Saxon grammar. in some instances to the prejudice, it must be regretted, of the student's judgement.

The regularity of W.S., its comparative lack of exceptions, and of curious forms for familiar words, instantly makes themselves felt in passing from the other dialects. But the student, in the light of the teaching of the other dialects, at once perceives that the symmetry of form is not necessarily the result of orderly and consistent development, but often of the subsequent influence of analogy. He will also it is likely feel that he is dealing with a self conscious and literary language with well-defined scribal traditions; differences that in the other dialects find ingenuous expression in the orthography are here obscured

The same method is followed in treating this dialect, as was used in treating the others. Though as regards special features of localisation this may seem to be in certain cases barren of results, yet the general and important result will be obtained of making decisively clear that which separates the W.S. from the other dialects — that which gives it in a word its marked dialectic character.

We take up at once the breaking before h and h + cons. The texts are those used by Cosijn in his Altwestsächsische Grammatik, the notation used is his as explained above.

Cura Pastoralis :-

(§3.2) eahta 465.23, etc., eahtian 227.17, feax 139.17.21 etc., fleah (allugo) 65.4 etc., fleax 87.18.21, leahte 292.7, leahtrian 092[28] etc., meaht 157.17.18 etc., meahte (potui) 7.24 etc., pleah (periculo commoveri) 37.7, reahte (exposui) 395.11 etc., gemeaht 47 17 etc., geseah 5.9 etc., seax 187.5 etc, aetreahte (prostravit) 114.10, seahtian 55.22 etc., geleaht 287.14, weaxan 139.13.25 etc., aweahte 139.1 etc.

Orosius :-

eahtela 0160.8 etc., (ge)feaht 0156.24 etc., seahtrian 092.28, meahte 017.13.16 (two cases only), rea(h)tigean (disputare) 0130.26. - seax 0244.18. Da Seaxan 0288.21. sæd-leahting 0154.27 etc., weax (cera) 080.3, 016 8.15, weaxan 016.12.

Chronicle :- meahte (potuit) 418.8 17 (1.) (Lauf.)

The following exceptions are to be noted (§3.7) :-

Cura Pastoralis :- maehte (potuit) 6.24, pleh (periculo commisit) 36.7, rehte 395. 26, we rehton 73. 21, 173.14, 179.11 geraht 117.11, 377.22, untrahte 115.16, lehte 293.7 mehte (potuit) 113.14.

Orosius :- maehte 052.31, 074.32, maehten 056.31, mehten 046.24, geraht 054.5, flexes (lini) 0158.1, flexe (lino) 0158.5, "mehte (potuit.. possot) mehte (n). (possent) mehten, -an (potuerant, possent) zusammen 159 mal; niemals mih(e)hte, weshalb unklar hier nicht anzunehmen ist."

NB note below the other cases of e for ea that their character may be seen.

'Ps.P.:- mid elle 275[22] elleo 189[15] 199[7] ellenga 457[4] helfcuene 125[8] afellad 437[3] gellan (fellen) 260[15] gere (certo) 191" 429[9] forgét, -get 393[17] 423[16] medderf 305[3] andweord 133[18] 339[18] hundeweord 297[10] 295[17] acol 125[4.17], unscerfullice 262[7], ongen 227[7] 405[10] togenes 89[18] 257[9] mereuuenes 210[18]: Oro. hwarfigende 0286.19 acol 062 7. 0100[15], acel 0246[27] forgef 0268[21] onget 0222[2] horgan. 0114[3] 08[17], ongen 0200[3] 010[4]. Chron. exoter 491. hwerf 633, ongen 878.

What is to be said of the testimony of the exceptional forms? Of these with ae, generally 654.5 many at once be set aside. The forms of which are possibly of greater significance. Unless we can believe that vowel carried over from the present ind. or optative, these cases would seem to fall in with the forms found in North. and Mercian. So the ea possibly for e? Ae occurs for e elsewhere only in ec bearo 38. 183[12] for bearo 319[10] gesaeran 211[3] sweorn 214[10] spraece 243[19] 370[15.15], of which cases Cosijn says "dass hier überall das r dem vocal vorangeht oder folgt und wo kein zufall" (I. § 20). The only case in Oros. is swaeran 044[32] where the ae is corrected to e. Yet it is in Orosius that the forms in question are most common.

Turning now to the forms with e. we find a well defined group with e in the place of ea before h. ht. It is by no accident for example that Oros-

affords 159 cases of meht-, over against two of meaht:

This e then is no accidental matter. How is it to be explained? Is it possibly an umlaut form? But the umlaut is regularly e, i — a fortiori in Orrmin i, without exception.

Is it simply palatal umlaut? Examples need scarcely here be adduced to prove W. S. averse to any palatal umlaut that would occur at expense of a diphthong, and particularly the diphthong ea.

Is it simply an omission of the glide owing to the unstressed character of the word? Such omission never shows such uniformity.

But then — and here we touch upon the quick of the matter — the use of this e must be due to qualitative conditions. Is there warrant for supposing this e to indicate length?

There is warrant, and the e explains itself as due to the same causes [illegible]

the lengthened for North. and Merc. above, length taking the place of the breaking.

The warrant is as follows. After speaking of the use of ê for âe in syllables under the secondary stress, Bosworth goes on to say (§ 56) "Vereinzelt ondrede (metrat) 728[6], medeldæ- 0164[28]. Swerum breenium (solis exemplis) 204[10] begreife ich nicht."

But this ê is not "vereinzelt". In Oros. (§ 61) to 18 cases of neah, occur 11 of neh and two of nah.

Yet again for âe, the umlaut of a < ai, we find aled, Keled 57.9., Kett 9108[7] on se 0180[2] heten (vocatus) 0222[24] (wol schreibfehler, schwerlich umlaut), hett (vocat) 08[21] se mesta 05[4] se 04[13] wrenneesse 01[5], gedeldunn (Thes. 718

The lack of this recognition of this symbol we may subject to still further confirmation

if we glance back at the list of the exceptional
e's, apart from those before h, noted on p. ( )
cases like answered, bridesmaid, seal for scald,
etc., may be thrown aside at once, but the long
list of e's before l at once attracts attention.
when we consider the usual clear partition
of a's before that remnant into a's and ea's.
this may be explained as the characteristic
W.S. representative of the Northern â — cf.
above gedaelan Chron. 718. If this is to
hold, we should find as variant forms
æl, and el, as variant forms of the rem-
nant of a before l. Such is the case. Beside
the regular ie, i. the remnant of the ea
forms, we have æl, and el. — baldo 40[17]
209[7], beldo 455[21.bis] bieldo 41.17, cfold 463[18]
geneldan 118[17] welm 447[9] welle 48[11] wæl
469[4], Chron. woelfill 591. The influence of w
is only correct to be perceived in several of these

examples, but the interchange of æ and e is plain.

Looking again at the list of exceptions we note gere, forgét with accent, orgen, ongét, forgef. The presumption of length in these cases is strong.

It may suggest itself as a question demanding an answer why with the marked number of occurrences of meht in Orosius we do not find there, also, a list of cases of eal + cons, to parallel that of the Cura Pastoralis. The answer is readily found in the fact that the Oros. has ea almost without exception — four cases of all; elsewhere eall, one case of aldermon to 30 of ealdorman, 139 cases of wald (I wold) plainly due to the influence of w. So also the unvaried use of a before l + cons. in Orosius is exclusively ie, i.e., never æ, e.

The question now arises why were these expedients used. We can scarcely suppose Mercian influence

the Mercian form would have been maehte, like the Anglian. Presumably it is to be explained as phonetic, actually equivalent to the ê-sound.

Finally a word more regarding the quantity. This ê is found for âe — but the e is not found for æ. In the second place, we are to see in the forms with æ the corresponding forms to those with a before l + cons. Of these forms with a, what is to be said? Is it to be supposed that short a divided into short a and into the breaking ea. On the contrary, we must necessarily suppose a long a where the breaking did not occur — and this appears in Middle English in $\overset{aa}{\wedge}$ beside ea. So where the æ appears in maehte or other forms with before h + t. we must reasonably assume length. — a length for which proof was discovered in Anglian.

The supposition is then that these forms with æ. e are exceptional forms conforming with the

testimony of the other dialects. What is the rule for this particular dialect?

The rule for W.S. is the breaking of a, e, i before h. h + cons. to ea, eo, io. This is assumed for all other dialects, and its non-existence explained as due to palatal umlaut. This assumption it has been the object of this discussion so far to [illegible].

For W.S. then a special and dialectic breaking is assumed. In other words the a and e before h + t, in place of becoming long as in North. and Merc. and presumably in Kentish, broke precisely as they broke before r + cons. This does not necessarily imply that h and l developed in W.S. a peculiarly guttural character. It does imply that they broke the vowel instead of lengthening it, and an explanation of this is to be found in the fact, proof of which is to be found in several directions, that W.S. was characterized by a marked tendency

towards palatal character in the vowels. It is this which appears markedly in the different mutant-mutations. It is the which explains why in W.S. palatal diphthongisation after initial palatals took place so early and was carried through so consistently in such marked contrast with the other dialects. And interesting proofs of this difference will appear in Middle Engl. developments.

With this dialectic heightening, and in relation with it was necessarily an insistence upon the essentially guttural character of the consonants, the result of which was that the consonant combination assumed the length, and the short palatal vowel necessarily broke as before r + cons. In the case of the l, there was naturally a difference, for here from the beginning the labial as well as the guttural quality of the l had tended to keep back the palatalisation of the vowel. The result is that we have

development in either the direction of pure labial quality expressed by the w. or of [illegible] palatal quality plus glide expressed by the breaking as Ten Brink once incidentally suggested (Z. f. d. Alt. x.ix); that we must perhaps assume a special guttural quality for the l in the L. u. W. S. This would scarcely be consonant with the fact that we find e unbroken by the l. over the entire field except where it is backed by an additional guttural or labial. The question is really one of relative strength of vowel and consonant, the strong palatal e dominates the ordinary l + cons. combinations, — but not e.g. the l is backed by h or f. the characteristic combination is emphasised at expense of the vowel, which breaks.

To complete here an abstract of the story — as a transforming factor possibly to offset the [illegible] things from breaking, came in the later palatalisation

This was not however to affect W.S. as it had affected the other dialects. This the gram. says states as a fact, but without offering an explanation, for he has the puzzling question to answer why it is that W.S. shows preference for palatal quality so markedly in certain directions, why it is that in the matter of palatal umlaut itself, this dialect in certain cases goes further than others. The explanation, however, is found in the fact that the W.S. pictured to retain certain typical diphthongs — ea. eo. ie — Of these it is ea that is most carefully conserved in marked contrast with the other dialects, and for the reason that W.S. alone possessed this well-marked typical diphthong, and is natural consequence of its special breakings. This matter of the conservation of the diphthongs in relation to the general trend and feeling of the language, and in relation to the possibility of traditional orthography will be found

discussed later.

The following are the forms with breaking of c, which appear in their texts: —

teohchiode 305[5] teoch [h] and 281[2] etc., toohhad 280[2] tiohchiad 302[3]h etc; feoh 250[23] etc pleoh 193[7] geseoh 153[20]

cneoht 97[12] etc., cnioht 49[7], cniht 25[8] 066[16] etc., cneht 287[10]; feohtan 107[24] 431[7], 042[33] etc; riht-, 216[23], 326[4.5] 367[20] (clear here right).

sixte 46[18] siexte-41[18], 154[2] wriexle 341[18] wrixle 311[18] sien 042[25] etc.

The forms with i retain i except in weobud betiiex etc., discussed above.

11 and o. umlaut.

This umlaut does not occur before r, g. The reason of this is obviously that the umlaut did not begin to affect W. S. until a time when the gutturals were so far affected towards palatal quality as

to prevent the umlaut. Otherwise we should have in evidence probably from original a affected vowel, unmistakably distinguished from the umlaut-diphthong, — and certainly if the WS. had ever been in possession of an ea or eo from this source, its cause would have been to retain it.

C. and g prevent the umlaut. However does not. This is in accordance with the theory of palatal umlaut by partition advanced above.

The vowels more generally affected are e, and i, but not with the consistency of the Northern dialects. A is not affected. The form cearu 302[9], given by Cosijn and spoken of by Sievers 105.2 as due to the umlaut, is of course no example at all. Cosijn also admits dalog gen. sg. 0222[7] and ds. ealod 0222[5], and though Sievers is disposed to admit this as the single example of umlaut of a, we are tempted to ask whether the North. genitive ables may not suggest

a different explanation. i.e. many it will breaking levelled through.

If the question be asked why, if, as we have assumed, the vowel a tended to more markedly palatal pronunciation than in the North, it was not in W.S. subjected at least in some degree to the influence of the umlaut, it may be pointed out that as remarked above W.S. began to be affected only at a late period and was but little affected at all, — that the umlaut of e itself is not consistently carried through — and finally that the umlaut of a even in the Anglian field is a more or less dubious matter.

To present the matter briefly and clearly a scheme is appended displaying the conduct of the three vowels a, e, i, when followed by g, c, l, r, + guttural vowel. Changes produced by such combinations should really be classed as intermediate between breaking and u-o umlaut: —

	Orm.	C.P.
a + g + guttural vowel	a	a
a + c + " "	a	a
a + l + " "	a	a
a + r + " "	a	a
e + g + " "	e	e
e + c + " "	e	e
e + l + " "	e	e : eo
e + r + " "	e	e
i + g + " "	i	i ie
i + c + " "	i	i
i + l + " "	eo. io[5]	i o
i + r + " "	i. ie[7]	i. eo. io

Weras. werod, 02^{6} $044^{22.32}$ 046^{4} 0246^{22} against weorod $080^{17}(6)$ and exclusively world.-uld.

Te[o]la (-), he[e]lan 449^{6} heolad 449^{5}, ne[o]lan 331^{16}, ll.

The unbroken cases are cuelan, dela, fela, helan etc.

Beran, unwerodre, teran, weres, against single exception weould

Tieglan $161^{12.20}$ gediegene 375^{14}

No exceptions. Zela 281^{20} in Cot. tilian (Hal) 22i. 21e 41i,

Hria (7) hiera (76) heora (276) hiora (107) heora 0141^{12}, hier (wirtys) 076^{25} hire (14) hiere (63) sweoran (collum) 0256^{12} (294[10]

Hira, hiera, heora, hiora (earum); hire (eges) hiere hera 307^{20}: swiran (collum) 31^{18} etc (3); sweoran 228^{9} sweore (columnâ) 304^{7}k, 305^{1}.

The evidence with regard to c and g is plain enough; they prevent u. o. umlaut. The exceptions in the case of i (Note 4) do not hold. The first, liegian, has had the vowel moved long since Cosijn's time and the second, gedieg-ene, is to be regarded as having long e due to loss of c.

Next as regards r. l. plus guttural vowel. A is not affected. The vowel next higher in palatal quality remains in Oxx. before l: in C.P. six forms with eo are balanced by a number, in-cluding the same words. These cases are then spo-radic. Before r. Oxx. has weorod six times to werod five; weorold is doubtful, as possibly a case of breaking. C.P. has no cases except of weorold.

With i, we have at once greater consistency. The notes carry their own explanation. Even here the W. S. has not carried the umlaut through consistently.

Palatal umlaut of the breaking:

The monophthongisation of the breakings ia and ea before r + c.q. is not found. W.S. exhibits monophthongisation only in the case of ie, and that generally only in consequence of i-umlaut. The palatal heightening of eo to ie as in liht and seolf are not found in these texts.

It naturally submits to palatal influence more readily than r or l. The efforts of this as regards the monophthongisation of ie appears in Prosnis, where there are 57 cases of ie to 129 of i before r (^ initial palatal influence is also to be considered), before l 110 cases of ie to 10 of i, before h. i exclusively.

Levijn's example aseolce 275^{20} as compared with swelgan 439^{3} etc. telga 359^{8} confirms the view that e was more strongly guttural than g. Here the breaking eleacnes $289^{19.22}$ may be called to mind.

checking of éa, éo. does not occur. The form neah for neah beside neah must be considered a compromise form, not the palatal umlaut of neah

Umlaut conditions:-

A brief survey has been given in the case of each dialect, of the umlaut conditions in order to illustrate the general tendency of the South, as contrasted with the North to yield to palatal affection.

The W. S., like the Anglian, retains in a number of cases the æ-stage of the umlaut of a. To institute a quantitative comparison between the Anglian and W. S. texts would be a task too long and too difficult. The W. S. preference for the heightened umlaut-vowel is to be readily perceived by a comparison of any single North- with any W S text.

The umlaut of ea, eo to ie, with further

reduction i. e., as a marked feature of W. S. as compared with non-W. S. retention of the simple e.

Oe is hardly to be found as the umlaut of o in W. S. The vowel has become entirely surrounded to e. Coupled with this the frequent retention of oe in the Non-W. S. texts. The question of their relative age of course enters into the matter. but the retention of the oe is most marked. even taking this into consideration. The same holds true of the umlaut of ô.

ê a umlauts to ie, whereas in English we have e and ei; so also eo > ie, where in the North the diphthong is retained, unaffected.

There are matters of such common understanding owing to the use of the W. S. as a basis for grammatical study, — and the texts used are so free from exceptions — that lists of examples are not felt to be necessary.

The following facts are to be noted concerning the consonants considered by themselves:-

C: There is epenthesis of c in scnicendan 1557, horscheualum 017[36]. For the latter popular etymology might be suspected. Also in jacentien 85[8] etc Corinctherum 211 etc., due to the familiar combination nc, and the infrequency of the combination of n + voiceless dental.

G: (§135) In anslaut, g is always found after palatal vowels. After velar guttural vowels it interchanges with h[2], also after r in one or two cases of burg, (in compounds). and in orsorhlic or 264[9] After l only in sulh 088[8] gl ; hl in sâhlas,-um. ?(Cotton), remaining g in Hatton and in Bosworth

The difference here is plainly in the first place one of surd and sonant, - furthermore the

[1] lâag, maeg, waag, mâag, bêag, dréag, léag

[2] wâg. = wah, genog = genoh, elog = eloh.

g is evidently the recognised symbol for the palatal spirant, weakened towards vocalisation. This appears in its use after palatal vowels i, ie in forms like saegde beside forms without the g, its use in forms like bygrg affected by i umlaut, it, use beside the usual h to express the accented vowel, palatal spirantal in forms like gedrigd 346, 18, wrigt. 72[9], oferetigd 33[13]. The familiar use of it as an indicator of length in brig beside bre is also to be mentioned, and the doubling of g in ig. ĝg before e, i in such forms as liggeo, ligge gebigged, where the two gs evidently express two different stages of palatal affection.

In certain cases it has entirely disappeared :— dysi 267', inferd, Mlaf, Chron. 755, 828 monmenia 0116[24] medie 086[28] and in the familiar cases before d, and n; anne m 0280[12] (corrected), ane 353[18]. manes 078[27] are notable forms noted by Bosworth.

The variations met with in the geminated forms are of interest and value. cg is evidently recognised as the definite equivalent of a Gothic gg and the result is the frequent insertion of an additional g to express the palatal element following, thus results forms like gebyrgeam 326[16], or with the inversion of the cg occasionally met with, the commonly appearing gebryggeam 327[16].

The guttural nasal becomes palatal through i-umlaut and affords forms like endlengest 222[21], gebrengeam 385[17] gebringeam 1118[32] hondbegengea 272[2] etc.; the g even disappears leaving the n only in gebrinst 89[9] etc. often, says Cosijn, with correction.

For the g of this ng combination, not infrequently cg appears — hincgfert Chron. 755, bebrincgde 16[16] gemencge 79[9], geongcge Chron. 871, [illegible] e only g, strenge 41[14] etc. It is from these cases

and the use of c for g before l etc., which is occasionally met with, that is the sole evidence of the possibility that a guttural voiced stop was recognised in Anglo-Saxon. Sievers edited [illegible] and says very truly: "Es fragt sich aber, ob die gutturale media nicht mehr [illegible] als man bis jetzt annahm, z.b. vor liquidae: wenn für die existenz derselben -nc als beweis in der verbindung ng angeführt wird, kann man fällen wie âcléaw und andern (z.b. in den glossen Haupt 9. 432 flg) nicht ohne weiteres jede beweiskraft ab-sprechen. In unserm texten kenne ich blos hefeclicor 270[13] kelcd 577, letzteres form wird jedoch durch ic cenne 'ungenant' 333' nicht gestützt."

71. It would seem to follow from what has been said of g, that x would in [illegible]

indicating
more distinctively a guttural sound; this does not necessarily follow; the only fact which would seem to indicate this is its interchange with g in dunklect after [illegible]. The function of g to represent a spirant whose sibilancy is attenuated almost to full vocalic quality is indeed recognised; but from this the conclusion is not to be drawn that h did not also represent at times a distinctly palatal sound, as for example before t.

The geminated forms in hch used at first sight seem attempts to express a stronger spirant in the anlaut of the second syllable but the other forms teoch[h]ard 281², tisc-hiard 39/ 28.29 would seem to indicate the reverse. The use of ch here used seem to be modelled on that of cg; but its purpose can only be to express the guttural spirant, h being elsewhere the symbol of breath, as g is of vocalisation.

Ih disappears and in the ordinary conditions:

J: One fact only is noteworthy in regard to *j*, and that is its rare retention in auslaut as in cāg, ieg(buend), iēg(land). Cosijns explanation that it is retained only when an original terminal vowel has disappeared is not particularly helpful. Mr dues Searcis remark that it is so found only after a long vowel of Thrus any direct light upon the matter It is more particularly noteworthy that the terminal g from original *j* is found only after long palatal vowels. It would then be presumably purely vocalic and retained in general to indicate length, an additional g even being inserted as in the geminated forms referred to by Sievers (§24 Note) — egge for ege, wiggend for wigend, eggje from eg. and also such forms as iggard, iggiot.

But here again also may be geminahin of g
to indicate different degrees of palatal glimmer

General conditions in West Saxon:—

The curious and distinctively dialectal feature of W. S. is the lack of palatal umlaut in certain positions on the one hand and the advanced stage of that umlaut elsewhere on the other.

For example, ea persists before h. and before r + c, g. Ea, eo remain undisturbed. Yet where in North. eo checks to e, in W. S. we find ie, i, and the umlaut mark generally have assumed a higher grade of palatal quality.

There is certainly not the slightest question with regard to the palatal umlaut where it has occurred. The phenomenon with which we are most particularly concerned is the absence of it in certain cases which are (1) the ea before

h, ht. (2) the ea before h (3) the ea. eo. before r+g, (4) the êa. êo before c. g h. — in brief the general conservation of diphthongs before c and g.

This feature of W. S. becomes striking when the Anglian dialects are compared with it. The explanation of the difference is to be found in the diversity of conditions obtaining in the two dialects at the time when the later palatalising influence set in.

In the first place as regards ea and eo. The state of the case was as follows. W. S. had favored the development of ea. There was ea without exception before r + cons., there was ea practically without exception before h + cons.. there was ea almost without exception before l. After palatals, a had become ea. The words with long ea formed a numerous class, and there was distinct tendency

of it after palatals.

With regard to eo, the state of the case was different. Its occurrence was limited as compared with the ea. It was found only before r and h, barring a few cases before l + c.q. Its occurrence after palatals was limited to the comparatively few cases after w + mid j. Of adding the numerous cases of the ea, the frequency of its occurrence was increased - probably however not until palatalisation had set in - by the weakening of u-o umlaut. Yet again - a fact of importance in an orthographic connection - it interchanged frequently with io. Among the long vowels there was the ēo, the īo after palatals, i.e. original j, and the few contract verbs and other contract forms.

Beside the ea and the eo (io) we find ie. The W.S. preference for diphthongs over hers appears so markedly as in its employment

of this characteristic diphthong. I-umlaut in the North meant monophthongisation; the W.S. replaces diphthong by diphthong. The e before r, h, h+cons., in forms with following i becomes ie. The eo after original j becomes ie. The umlaut of ea of whatever origin is expressed by ie. The e after palatals is diphthongised to ie. Le ove appears by no means infrequently as a form of the u and o umlaut of i. Long éo and éo became ie. Long i, finally, often appears with a following i, particularly after palatals and in combination with w (Cosijn, h. 90).

[1] So expressed because ie is perhaps umlaut not of eo, but io.

[2] If the sound expressed was actually the same as that of the umlaut of eo, either the first element of ea had become similar to that of eo, or else (as would be more probable) the sounds produced by the umlaut had fallen together.

From this it appears that the W.S. had a very clearly defined ea type and ie-type, and a less clearly defined eo type. What was to be the result when the new palatalising influence set in? Monophthongisation was to have been expected, and monophthongisation ultimately took place of necessity, and the later texts bear record of it as well as the testimony of Middle English developments. But how early this occurred we cannot say. What we do know is that in the early texts ea persists. It is very possible that this is in some measure scribal formalism, but of this we cannot be certain, for we can seem to see the influence of this ea type in the maintenance of forms like meahte in defiance of i-umlaut. Then too we must remember that this palatalisation had not yet finally

completed its work at the time of our first written records – that is, it was still a vital force – Monophthongisation undoubtedly occurred later, but survival at least of diphthongal quality is not to be argued for colloquial usage, when the consonant form still persists as a diphthongal form – that is as ie.

The typical character of this ea and its phonological character both rendered it immune from palatal umlaut. With eo however there was not only not the same support of group-similarity but both its phonological character and the abundant frequency of a diphthongal sound practically similar to the sound to which it was changed, led to an unmistakable record of that change in the texts. In brief ea influenced, but remained, at least orthographically, and probably substantially, in col-

[illegible] changed [illegible] in the other hand changes to iOE, ie, and the change is expressed by the use of the ie symbol.

That the written record is an unreliable, faithful transcript of colloquial usage, appears in the fact that the monophthongisation of ie – Theoretically the first to be expected to occur – is found beside ie in a way that shows divided usage and Transition. And here two may be instanced the indications of the glides found after i, ĭ. Yet again it appears in the discrimination of the various single words from each other – some with eo, some with ie, some with i – presumably in accordance with the Scribe's personal usage.

Again – to pass on – in the cases of long ea, eo, we have plain evidence of the influence of the type. This, in the case of the éa, appears not only in its persistence before c. g. but in

its umlaut to ie. "For the more pervasive of the éo, we cannot so strongly argue influence of the light, in spite of the marked difference from the Anglian, because so generally shows a disposition to resist palatal influence, even here in W.S. remaining in a number of cases untouched by umlaut". — but we may be all the more surprised for that very reason at the fact that it so generally umlauts to ie.

Let us now examine the conduct of these diphthongs before c and g. Here obviously the same arguments apply. Ea and eo occur before r + c, g; in both cases we have conservation of the typical diphthong. In the case

In third singulars, in derivatives of trēow

bēodh, steor, hreowan. The influence of

long ēo also reaches to such forms as seoh, þeoh, þeoh

of the ea, we may be confident that the stage of its palatal affection was not, if any, one which could be properly represented by ie. But whatever the change, if any, we may be sure it was not one of monophthongization.

Long ea and long eo are similarly preserved. Neah attracts attention. In Ornins 18 cases of neah occur beside 11 of neh and two of neeh. The neh form is of course not original. The word in contrast with Deah, which occurs 113 times as deh, peh, once as deh, once as daah. The forms with ē and ē occur in the Orosius (deh once in CP.) and the form daah in CP. Indubitably, we have here a phenomenon due to the unstressed character of the word; it appears through the whole range of the dialects. Even Ld. P. displays, at the, the single cases deh and daah. Now neah invites comparis-

son, for we have the influence of the preposition. Neak shows no such variation so far as the case in Orsais justify a comparison. Nek is accordingly a compromise form, due to wear in unaccented position.

Here then the matter rests. It is well to remember, that thinking as we do of the relation of typical dialect things, and the apparent evidence of the faithfulness of the record in representing colloquial usage, yet in many cases we must be sure how far change towards palatal quality had set in in the case of ea, and how far change in all the dialect signs in the direction of monophthongization - except of course ie. We are to remember that the West Saxon had become a self conscious and literary language, and it is only to be expected that hieratic tradition should be reproduced in its written forms. This would certainly seem

to appear in Southern records of Northern forms; it is impossible to believe that at the period these manuscripts were written the dialects had not appreciably left either for instance in the matter of monophthongization, and yet here we find conservation of the typical written forms.

It seems hardly necessary to enter into a detailed examination of Northumbrian and Mercian for purposes of comparison. It need only be pointed out that Anglian had no clearly defined diphthongal types; moreover preference for single vowels is characteristic of it. Ea occurred only before r + cons. (as a partial reflection of the group) and as a representative of æ. Short eo varied with ea. Long eo varied with io and with ea and no special symbol was employed for its i-umlaut. Palatal

affection and u-o umlaut must have been coincident or nearly so, for both follow i-umlaut, and accordingly there was no contribution of diphthongal forms from that source before c and g. The diphthongal umlauts of W.S. are unknown — there is but one case of ie in the Ritual possibly due to this cause — ansiene; the umlauts of the diphthongs are single vowels e and i, with exception of a few cases of the special diphthong ei, beside i. It is more than possible that variation in the use of ea. eo. may be simply due to the infrequency of diphthongs and consequent carelessness in their orthographic representation

Now the inference appropriate for our uses is this. There is no reason for us to posit a quality in the W.S. h, g, and c, different from that in the North. If u-umlaut was checked or stopped in precisely the same way, and

palatal umlaut, where there was no analogical influence to prevent it or orthographic to hypercise it, took place under the same conditions, and indeed to a higher degree of the affection than in the North.

We may now safely go a step further. Even as the Northern dialects display a less advanced stage of i-umlaut, so the consonants through which the umlaut worked have been less affected. The Northern dialects never felt it necessary to represent the palatalisation of a medial consonant by a following glide — or to speak more in accordance with the actual fact discarded the remnant of original j after c or g precisely as after other consonants. In W.S. on the other hand the palatalisation was thorough, and the remnant of the original j is accordingly permitted to remain and even finds orthographic expression.

The W.S. and the Northern dialects tell each a consistent story. The whole vowel scheme displays a leaning towards palatal affection, and this results on the one hand in the frequency of breaking, on the other hand in initial palatal diphthongisation. Both imply eventually an insistence upon palatal quality, and the diphthongs which result, involve ultimately a dissimilation process by which the palatal quality of the stressed element is accentuated. These diphthongs of luminous palatal quality, make their appearance wherever there is opportunity, implying of course palatalisation of neighbouring consonants, wherever palatalisation is possible.

In the Northern dialects on the other hand there is conservation of guttural and labial quality. The range of the ea is limited

to a position of the group . . and it is evident that after original j there was [illegible] in the beginning of the following diphthong.

Middle English developments will, it is believed from study so far made, confirm these results in an unmistakable way. The example of the development of c and g before the breaking from æ may be cited. as above — here alone of all the breakings unaffected by umlaut do we have c becoming ch, g becoming y, with gear as the sole exception, and that presumably a Northern word.

Conclusion.

There is comparatively little to be said in conclusion with regard to the main subject to which the study of the Anglo Saxon dialects is a contribution. With regard to that object, it will have attained its purpose if it has emphasised the fact that West Saxon is on the whole the most dialectic of the dialects, and that if we are to properly understand somewhat perplexed and obscure phonological developments, like those of the guttural palatal group we must put it on one side the classical and very possibly more or less artificial West Saxon forms, and get a glimpse of something nearer the true colloquial conditions in the forms of the other dialects. The average for Modern English speech was struck outside Wessex, and in tracing back from Chaucer's time

it is just as well to remember that the dialectic divisions held fairly [illegible] at all periods, — and that they were virtually the same conditions

A number of forms bearing upon the special points — interchange of g and h, survival of the voiced click etc. — have been collected and will be used in the general survey of illustrative forms, which is to follow. Special advantage was undoubtedly gained in examining these matters as they presented themselves in fairly consistent position in angle texts.

The greater number of the [illegible] problems cannot of course be decided until the full evidence of Middle English is in, and a most careful judgment has been formed from the various phenomena of vowel development and their dialectic distribution

With regard to matters to some extent at one side of the immediate subject, more com-

clusions have resulted, the most important of which is that concerning the lack of breaking of a before h. in non-W.S. dialects. The clear proof afforded by Northumbrian and Mercian, the testimony of such scanty evidence as was afforded by Kentish, the exceptional forms in W.S. all confirm the result, that in the matter of breaking before h the West Saxon (possibly in part the Kentish) was dialectic, and that elsewhere breaking was replaced by length. This two at once confirms the sporadic cases of the breaking of ê to W.S. — where indeed also, as the argument shows, the ht tended to shorten the preceding vowel, and that only sporadically.

In connection with the n.c consonant, Dr. Bright's theory of palatal consonant by partial was advanced and applied. With regard to n.c consonant the following facts become

evident. The u-o umlaut probably started in Mercian territory, as generally supposed. made its way into Kent, very probably as a result of Mercian domination, and reached there a wider development than it did in Northumbria. A is unaffected in Northumbria, and c and g prevent the affection while in Kent we have conditions similar to the Mercian. West Saxon experienced the affection to a still less degree.

Its influence became marked in Kent probably early in the 8th century as we find the first examples of it midway in that century. The Saxon conquest checked its progress less than would be expected. Clear evidence of its marked influence display themselves in a monophthong of palatal quality for original a

The ê in Anglian was argued to be an orthographic equivalent for W.S. éa. A similar ê was proved for W.S.

The general preference of W.S. for [illegible]

sounds, and the levelling to the three types ea, eo, ie, was explained and discussed. In this connection the fact was emphasised that e was to be considered the proper umlaut of ea, as æ of a; that the W.S. ie is a special and dialectic retention of diphthongal quality, and a special and dialectic heightening.

It is believed that this view of the West Saxon as a more artificial, more formalised dialect is the true and useful one, and should be kept in mind in every inquiry; and particularly in all studies that concern transition from O.E. to Middle English, it is well to remember that even early Mercian forms represent far more nearly late W.S. than classic and representative W.S. forms themselves. [illegible] by way of [illegible] for example out that palatal umlaut was so widely spread and strongly marked in E. W.S.

as ever in Anglian.

The marked differences between W.S. and the non-W.S. dialects were dwelt upon in the Introduction. The single fact which explains and harmonises these differences — the more markedly palatal character of the W.S. vowels — has been already sufficiently emphasised, and the simplicity and consistency of the explanation, — its helpfulness in every direction — made clear. This, and the lack of breaking before h in non-W.S. it is hoped will stand as a real contribution towards an understanding of OE. phonology.

From this point advance will be made to take W.S. texts together mainly with early Middle English, — and with them will be studied forms gathered from every direction. Here the study of special and difficult words will begin — but apart from this it is hoped that the Latin texts will not only afford transition

forms at present only hesitated for the various vowels, and vowel combinations, but also will clearly indicate the beginnings of those levellings that afford sometimes a dozen or fifteen headings in the explanation of the origin of a single Middle English sound. Should this prove to be the case, it may be possible to reach back from this vantage ground then gained and increase our scanty knowledge of the Anglo-Saxon itself.

Life.

The writer, Clarence Griffin Child, was born in Newport, Rhode Island, March 22d, 1864, graduated at Trinity College, Hartford, to the degree of B.A. in 1886, and after 4 years service as Instructor in English and Mathematics to the degree of M.A. in 1891. The following year he studied in Munich under Profs. Breymann, Koeppel, and von Lexer, and in 1892 came to the Johns Hopkins University where he has since remained.